

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES  
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS · PUBLISHERS

VOLUME XXXVII · OCTOBER 1946 · NUMBER THREE



# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

---

HORATIO SMITH, *General Editor*

---

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

DINO BIGONGIARI

FEDERICO DE ONÍS

ANGEL DEL RÍO

LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

W. M. FROHOCK

MARIO A. PEI

HENRI F. MULLER

NORMAN L. TORREY

TOMÁS NAVARRO

DONALD M. FRAME, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XXXVII

OCTOBER 1946

NUMBER 3

## ARTICLES

Horatio Smith (1886-1946) 199

Were There Theaters in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries?  
DINO BIGONGIARI 201

The Impenitence of François Villon GRACE FRANK 225

Parody in the French Theater: A Note on Its Vogue  
SEYMOUR TRAVERS 237

Italian *Guglia*, *Giorno* and the Neo-Grammarians ROBERT A. HALL, JR. 244

Reply G. BONFANTE 247

## REVIEWS

William L. Fichter, editor, *Lope de Vega: El sembrar en buena tierra*.  
[C. E. ANIBAL] 252

Alexander Herman Schutz, editor, *The Romance of Daude de Pradas called  
Dels Auzels Cassadors*. [KURT LEWENT] 268

Blanchard W. Bates, *Literary Portraiture in the Historical Narrative of the  
French Renaissance*. [DONALD M. FRAME] 276

Joseph D. Bennett, *Baudelaire: A Criticism*. [S. S. WEINER] 279

Joaquín Casaldueiro, *Sentido y forma de las 'Novelas ejemplares'*. [STEPHEN  
GILMAN] 280

Joaquín Casaldueiro, *Vida y obra de Galdós (1843-1920)*. [ANGEL  
DEL RÍO] 282

Eleanor L. Turnbull, translator, *Contemporary Spanish Poetry. Selection  
from Ten Poets*. [ANGEL DEL RÍO] 286

Tomás Navarro, *Manual de entonación española*. [CLARENCE E. PARMEN-  
TER] 287

Books Received 289

Copyright, 1946, Columbia University Press

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, or 2960 Broadway, New York City. Single copies, \$1.00 (foreign \$1.10); \$4.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$4.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1946 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to Professor Norman L. Torrey, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the "Notes for Contributors" at the end of the February issue.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wisconsin, or Room 108, 2960 Broadway, New York City.



## HORATIO SMITH (1886-1946)

THE DEATH of Horatio Smith, on September 9, 1946, deprived the ROMANIC REVIEW of its General Editor and the members of the Department of Romance Languages of their leader and friend. THE REVIEW will sorely miss his keen critical mind, his understanding of the value of the written word, his wide acquaintance with American and European scholars, his unerring sense of justice, his tactful serenity. Since 1937 he had given it the benefit of editorial skill which he had already manifested in his Scribners' series of Modern French Classics and which will be apparent to the general public—as it is now apparent to scores of collaborating scholars—in his *Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature*. Under his direction, the REVIEW prospered even during the difficult war years; it is our regret that he could not live to see it prosper in better times.

Many knew him for the great teacher that he was, quick to perceive latent talent, unflinching in encouragement, and thorough in training methods. His own choice of the teaching profession among many in which he would have been equally successful was based on a firm, unflinching conviction of its value and dignity. To his colleagues he was an inexhaustible source of strength. The members of the Editorial Board mourn the wise counselor and friend, the man of many qualities and distinctions. Those who knew him intimately knew his genuine, deep, touching humility. With sincere and loyal affection we dedicate ourselves to the perpetuation of his spirit.

THE EDITORS OF THE  
ROMANIC REVIEW



## WERE THERE THEATERS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES?

---

UNDER THIS TITLE Professors R. Loomis and G. Cohen have published an article in *Speculum* (January 1945) the purpose of which is to demonstrate that contrary to a view often adhered to there were in the 12th and 13th centuries permanent buildings used for theatrical performances.

Those who are interested in the history of the theater should be grateful for this noteworthy contribution. Yet the case is far from settled and in what follows the opposite view will again be supported and the validity of the arguments so far presented will once more be tested.

Professor Loomis's conclusions are based, first, on the use of such words as *theatrum*, *scena* and their derivatives in the period under consideration; and, second, on a piece of fiction describing a devil's trial held in what seems to be the ruins of an ancient theater.

The first argument, like those of Gregorovius, De Bartholomaeis and others, seems faulty in that it assumes that the persistence of words implies the survival of the things originally signified by these words; also, that literary texts faithfully reflect contemporary conditions. An historical analysis of the quotations adduced by Professor Loomis, and of hundreds more that could be added, will show that such words as *theatrum*, *scena*, *thymele*, *theatrales*, *scenici*, *thymelici*, carried over from classical antiquity, came to be used to describe men, places, and spectacles quite different from those to which they were originally applied: namely to *jongleurs*, buffoons and jesters who performed in palaces and public squares, on street corners, in open meadows and in tents, upon platforms, on bridges—everywhere except in places which in the ancient or modern sense of the word we might reasonably call a theater.

The unhistorical approach of these investigators consists therefore, as I see it, in the failure to distinguish between what is obviously rhetorical, moralizing or encyclopedic antiquarianism and what is genuinely representative of contemporary conditions. They either fail to recognize the fact that a certain passage in a medieval writer is a more or less concealed quotation from a classical author, or else they assume that words of a remote past have kept their meaning unchanged.

This failure to distinguish literary fossils from living social organisms is the sole ground, it seems to me, on which scholars have systematically supported their medieval theaters.

I. The method above criticized may be illustrated by the following examples taken from Professor Loomis's quotations. He gives us (page 95) Uguccione's definition of *theatrum* which is, not in part, but in its entirety, reproduced from Isidore. What does this quotation prove? We find it repeated in exactly the same words in all centuries. Papias (eleventh century) has it. Rhabanus Maurus (ninth century) has it (*De Universo*, xx, 36; Migne P.L., 111, 553). The *Graphia* (eleventh-twelfth century) contains a full account copied verbatim from Isidore under the titles *De Scena et Orcistra* and *De offitiis scene*. All this material moreover appears, broken up, in numerous glossaries. And all it proves is that these men had before their eyes not theaters but the text of Isidore.

We can also illustrate moralizing as well as erudite antiquarianism from Professor Loomis's quotations. He gives us (page 44) a passage from the *Chronicle* of Richard of Devizes which reads as follows:

Vita talum et tesseram theatrum et tabernam; plures ibi quam in tota Gallia thrasones offendens; gnathorum autem infinitus est numerus: Histriones, scurrae, glabriones garamantes, palpones, pusiones, molles mascularii, ambubaiae, pharmacopolae crissoniae, phitonissae, vultuariæ noctivagae, magi, mimi mendici balatrones hoc genus omne totas replevere domos.

These are not living words in current usage during the twelfth century. The reality described is a milieu of debauchery and sodomy, enlivened by dancers and buffoons and exploited by fakers and fawners. But the contemporary features are concealed under cant phrases, in a *cento* of moralizing contumelies patched up with pieces from all centuries and many nations. We have the *pythonissa* of Old Testament days; the burning words of St. Paul, *neque molles neque masculorum concubitores*. The early Christian revilements drawn from the characters of Terence reappear: the *gnathones*,<sup>1</sup> the *thrasones*. Echoes from the Roman satirists: *palpo* of Persius (v, 176), caught up by John of Salisbury (*Polier.* iii, 4) and frequently recorded in the glossaries; an obscene usage of *pusio* from Juvenal (vi, 34), that again reappears in the 12th century. *Glabrio* is neither a medieval word nor one frequently used in classical antiquity; it is occasionally found in the glossaries (see Loewe, *C.G.L.*, v, 502, 569) as *faciei disceptor*.<sup>2</sup> Finally the favorite jingle from Horace, *Sat.* i, 2, 1, that was so often quoted from Flavius Vopiscus to Petrus Blesensis. All these pursuits are carried on, we are

1. Terence, *Eun.*, ii, 2, 33; cf. John of Salisbury, *Polier.*, iii, 4: "Tota enim gnathonicorum factio"; and St. Jerome, *Ep.* 50: "ex huius nomine Gnathonici vel Phormionici"; etc.

2. *Garamantes* must be a corruption of *chiramantes*, the latter form being frequently spelled with an *a* instead of the *i*.

told, in a place which is called *theatrum*; naturally enough, since Isidore had said (and every century had repeated his words) that the *theatrum* is *postribulum*, or, as others called it, a *lupanar*.<sup>3</sup> If we consider the various pursuits enumerated above by our chronicler we should have reached the same conclusions even without the aid of Isidore.

These words are then technical terms; not, however, of dramatists or historians, but of the moralists. The latter in the period we are considering were bent on enriching their vocabulary, mainly with the aid of ancient authors and the glosses thereon. Any antiquated word that was in any way reminiscent of the foul practices connected with the more or less histrionic amusements of the ancients was eagerly picked up. This explains the wealth of abuse in the above passage and in others similar to it.

The insertion of the familiar tirade from Horace deserves notice. Surely no one should claim that the *ambubaiae* and the *balatrones* were professional terms in the twelfth century. *Pharmacopola*, too, had lost its original sting and new meanings were being applied. How badly the details of this Horatian invective fit into the conditions of the twelfth century may be seen when it is recalled that the *mendici*, the beggars, were then and had been for a thousand years, in words at least, the object of love and solicitude, and that one of the commonest of medieval commonplaces is the contrast between the beggar beloved of God and the mime,<sup>4</sup> tool of the devil. The popularity of this Horatian line became so great that it was felt that its power could be maintained by truncated citation, by means of some one catch word or phrase, usually the *hoc genus omne* or the *collegium*. At times the juxtaposition of two or three of its most striking words was resorted to. So Otto of Freising (*Mon. Ger. Scr.*, xx, 244), Chron. vi, 32, speaks of *omne balatronum et histrionum collegium*; the *Summa* of Conrad (Rockinger, *Quellen* etc. ix, 429), presents the *ambubaiaiarum collegia* by the side of the *balatrones* and *mendici*; Peter of Blois, *Epist.* xiv,<sup>5</sup> has: *mimi, barbatores*,<sup>6</sup>

3. Loewe, *C.G.L.*, II, 586: "domus meretricum vel theatrum."

4. Passages in which kings and potentates are praised for feeding the poor and driving the *histriones* from their tables, or rebuked for doing the opposite, are frequent. See: Alcuin (*Mon. Ger. Ep.*, iv, 439; *loc. cit.*, p. 183); Agobard *Epist.* (a. 836); Henry III (a. 1044) is extolled (*Mon. Ger. Scr.*, II, 243) because at his marriage feast he fed the poor and *infinitam histrionum et ioculatorum multitudinem sine cibo et muneribus abire permisit*. For the disagreement between Alcuin and Angilbert (Homer) on the question of dramatics see: *Mon. Ger. Ep.*, iv, 290, 381.

5. De Bartholomaeis, *Storia*, etc., p. 33, erroneously attributes this passage to Eade Rigaud.

6. The most helpful reference for the understanding of this term is not in Du Cange. It is found in the *Lex Romana Ractica Curiensis*, viii, 4 (*Mon. Ger. Leges* v, 361) and reads thus: "quando aliqua publica gaudia nunciantur, hoc est elevatio regis aut nuptiae aut *barbatoria* etc." The reference to Petronius (*Fr. Trag.*, p. 73) is both too fragmentary and uncertain, the reading being the result of an emendation.

*balatrones, et hoc genus omne.*<sup>7</sup>

A well known scholar in the field of dramatic history, De Bartholomaeis, seems to be even less aware of the fact that these enumerations are nothing but rhetorical outbursts made up of outdated material having little or no connection with contemporary social conditions. He quotes in his *Storia della poesia drammatica italiana*, page 26, some of the terms used by John of Salisbury in the latter's long string of infamous professional amusements (*Polier.*, I, 8) and thinks that they correspond to as many recognized varieties of more or less histrionic pursuits. As an example he asks us to take (*op. cit.*, p. 26, n. 3) *salii*, *saliar*, *aemiliani*, *gignadii* and adds: "as for the meaning of these terms it is sufficient to refer to Du Cange s.vv." But if we follow his instructions we discover that Du Cange knows these terms only in so far as they appear in the same John of Salisbury, so that all he can do, for three of them, is to refer us back to the passage quoted above and as for the fourth (*salii*) ignore it altogether. As a matter of fact *emiliani* occurs only in this passage and one man's guess as to its meaning is as good as another. *Salii* and *saliar* in the sense of dancers appear in old glossaries but very rarely: the former in *Exc. Cod. Vat.* 1468 (Loewe C.G.L., v, 513), the latter in *Exc. Cod. Cass.* (Loewe C.G.L., v, 578), both defined as *striones* (*histriones*). This meaning probably goes back to Diomedes (Keil, I, 476) or to Servius (in *Aen.*, VIII, 285). *Gignadii*, finally, is obviously connected with *gymnasium* and may be a variant of the common *gignici*; but it too is found nowhere else. All of this shows how well, to use De Bartholomaeis' words (page 26), "the nomenclature adopted by these writers mirrors, naturally enough, the actual state of things."

De Bartholomaeis moreover informs us (page 70) that *balatrones* was the current term for dancers in this period. This information, it may be added, has been accepted and occasionally utilized. In reality, however, there is not a single text that could be adduced to sustain such an interpretation.

*Balatro* as all know is an old word. Its meaning was wavering and uncertain already in the classical period. It was supposed to be applied now to a jester, now to a rake (*luxoriosus*), occasionally to a spendthrift, being then spelled *barathro* (*quia bona sua in barathrum mittit*). Porphyrio (3rd century) says (in *Hor. Sat.*, I, 2, 1) *balathrones a balatu et vaniloquentia dicuntur*. The *Scholia in Horatium* explain (*loc. cit.*) *balatrones a balatu intortae vocis dicuntur qui idem et blatterones*, thus giving the word a meaning very close to our *babbler*.

Du Cange favored the derivation from *balare* but apparently thought

7. For additional instances of the popularity of this quotation see Alt, *Theater und Kirche*, pp. 401-402, and Viellard, *Gilles de Corbeil*, p. 380.

the word meant not to *bleat* but to *dance*, for he enters *balatro* under that heading. He does not however give any reason for this departure, nor furnish any example. De Bartholomaeis, either originally or through Du Cange, comes to the same strange conclusion and with great assurance informs us that the dancers in this period were regularly called *balatrones*. He too fails to give any reason and offers no example except the well-known quotations in which the meaning of the word is in no manner indicated, being a mere repetition of the text of Horace or of some other classical writer.

One might perhaps say that people in the twelfth century coming across this unusual word instinctively connected it with *ballare* because of similarity in sound. For this, however, we should need a clear statement, something more definite than the usual string of vague learned revilements. Moreover, if we examine the medieval MSS, both those of classical authors and those of contemporary ones, we do indeed find a steady tendency toward a catachresis, but one which completely does away with the meaning of *dancers*. For the word is with extreme frequency spelled *baratrones* or *barathrones*, showing that the scribes were thinking of *barathrum* and not of *ballare*. In fact, the MSS of Pierre de Blois' text above quoted read *barathrones* and the form *balathrones* which appears in the printed editions is the result of an emendation.

The practice of incorporating old texts in one's own discourse for the purpose above described is very old. We find Leidradus (*Mon. Ger. Ep.*, iv, 541) saying: "Velut cum theatrorum moles extruuntur et efodiuntur fundamenta virtutis, cum ex his quae divitibus abundant luxuriantur histriones, et necessaria vix habent pauperes. . . . Si circensibus quispiam delectetur, si athletarum certamine, si mobilitate hystriionum, si formis mulierum . . . per oculorum fenestras animae est capta libertas. Rursum auditu si vario organorum cantu . . . et carmine poetarum et comoediarum mimorumque urbanitatibus et strophis etc.," which is a patchwork from two or three old texts but is mainly derived from St. Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, ii, 8.<sup>8</sup>

It is interesting in this regard to point out a mistake by Isidore (*Etym.*, xviii, 42, and in part again in *Etym.*, xv, 2.34), repeated after him by practically all subsequent writers from the 9th to the 13th centuries who have dealt with the matter, viz. that people *stood up* in the theater (*quo stantes omnes inspiciunt . . . quod in eo populus stans etc.*). Isidore is giving us here an antiquated view that had ceased to be true more than half a millennium before his days. He must have read some text like the following from Tacitus (*Annales*, xiv, 20): "Si vetustiora

8. This passage is quoted by John of Salisbury, *Polier.*, viii, 6.



repetas stantem populum spectavisse"; or more likely from Livy (48th *Periocha*) "cum locatum a censoribus theatrum extrueretur . . . ex S.C. destructum est *populusque* aliquamdiu stans ludos spectavit."

II. The failure to recognize this antiquarian quality of medieval texts was responsible for Gregorovius's statement that there were theaters in Italy in the tenth century.<sup>9</sup> In his *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* (Book VI, Chapter 7) we read the following:

It is an established fact that in the tenth century theatrical performances took place in northern Italy. At that time when so many Greek expressions came into use, actors received the name of *Thymelici*, so that the ancient *Thyme*le of the Sophoclean stage in an age which no longer had any notion of tragedians came to give its name to Comedians. Atto of Vercelli protests against ecclesiastics who appear on scenes of theatres; he urges them to leave the table as soon as the *thymelici* appear. . . . The *Graphia* dedicated two paragraphs to theatrical amusements. Poets, Comedians, Tragedians, scenes and orchestras, histrions, dancers and gladiators are mentioned and the expression *thymelici* which was then actually employed shows that at least one feature of what the *Graphia* relates was something more than a mere antiquarian reminiscence. It is not too bold to assert that at the court of Hugo, Marozia and Alberich mythological scenes were performed.

How much truth is there in all this?

The passage of the *Graphia* on which he bases his argument is the following (Schramm, *Rom*, etc., II, 91-92):

De scena et orciatra. In scena que fit infra theatrum in modum domus cum pulpito quod orciatra vocatur cantant comici tragici atque saltant histriones et mimi. In orciatra vero saltator saltat et duo inter se disputant. In ea poete, comedi et tragedi ad certamen conscendunt hisque canentibus alii gestus edunt virorum et feminarum. De Offitiis scene. Offitia scenica tragedi, comedi thymelici histriones et saltatores. . . . In amphitheatro pugnant gladiatores etc.

All this, of course, is taken verbatim from Isidore, *Etym.*, XVIII, 43, 44, 45, 52, and all it shows again is that the author of the *Graphia* had the text of Isidore before his eyes. The affirmation, moreover, that this is the first time Roman spectacles are mentioned since the days of Cassiodorus is wrong, for Isidore comes in between, also Rhabanus Maurus, and a dozen others. The Greek word *thyme*le was not, as Gregorovius says, then introduced into Italy, but had been used there and elsewhere continuously for the last ten centuries.

9. This view was shared by Davidsohn, *Storia di Firenze*, p. 1170, n. 2. The recent Italian translation of Gregorovius accepts it without challenge.



This last point is interesting enough and has been perplexing enough to justify here a detailed refutation of Gregorovius' statement in the course of which we pass from literary to juridical antiquarianism.

Gregorovius gives in his notes as evidence for the statement above quoted the following passage from Atto's *Capit.*, 42 (*M.P.L.*, 134.38): "non oportet ministros altaris vel quoslibet clericos spectaculis aliquibus quae in *nuptiis* aut in *scenis* exhibentur interesse sed antequam thymelici ingrediantur surgere eos de convivio et abire debere." These words, however, are an exact quotation from the ancient translation of c.54 of the Council of Laodicea (fourth century), except that where Atto has *scenis* it reads *caenis*, correctly enough, for the Greek original has: *δειπνοῖς*. This law was in subsequent centuries frequently and correctly quoted either in part or as a whole. When we come however to the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (a. 816) we see that a significant change has taken place for there we find (chapter 83): "non oportet sacerdotes aut clericos quibuscumque spectaculis in *scenis* aut *nuptiis* interesse sed antequam thymelici ingrediantur exsurgere." Is the alteration due to the changed meaning of *caena* and the consequent supposition that the word represented a scribe's misspelling of *scena*?

The correct reading was apparently known to Pope Hadrian I (a. 773) who in his *Epitome Canonum* (*Mansi*, xi, 868) says "ne clericis ludicris spectaculis intersint in *cenis* vel *nuptiis* sed ante discedant quam thymelici veniant." It is still known to Regino of Prüm, who, in his *De Eccl. Discipl.*, i, 327 (*M.P.L.*, vol. 132), states: "non licet sacerdotibus vel clericis aliqua spectacula in *nuptiis* vel *conviviis* spectare sed oportet antequam ingrediantur etc." As we see, Regino Prumensis has kept the sense but has seen fit to change the word from *cenis* to *conviviis* perhaps for the reason above stated.

Gratian gives official and universal validity to this provision which appears in his *Decretum* (III pars. dist. v, 37) with the exact wording of the old translation of the Laodicean council's provision except for the substitution of *scenis* to *cenis*.<sup>10</sup>

So then the word *thymelici* had not, as Gregorovius says, been introduced for the first time in northern Italy in the tenth century. It had been there (and elsewhere) all along and it was being used by people who like Atto were interested in the discipline of the church and who naturally invoked the authority of the old Councils in their endeavors to check disorders of their day, even though the outward form of these disorders had changed from what it had been in the fourth century. The

10. For more precise determination of all these variations a careful study of the various MSS would be needed.

tenth-century *scenae* owe their existence to a scribe's attempt at text emendation.

Another legal fossil found in the text of Atto of Vercelli has more recently been utilized to establish Gregorovius' contention. It is the injunction contained in Atto's *Capit.* chapter 78 (*M.P.L.*, 134. 43) which states: "Nec non et illud petendum ut spectacula *theatrorum* caeterorumque ludorum die dominica vel caeteris christianae religionis diebus celeberrimis amoveantur. Maxime quia Sancti Paschae octavarum die, populi *ad circum* magis quam ad ecclesiam conveniunt, deberent transferri praefiniti ipsorum dies quando evenerint nec debet ullus *christianus cogi ad spectacula*." The obvious anachronistic elements of this provision are explained by the fact that this is a mere repetition of an order of the *Concilium Africanum* of 424 (see *Conc. Omn. Regia Coll.*, iv. 531).

If we turn from canon to civil law we encounter the same process. Gualcausus tells us (Fitting, *Institutionenglossen des Gualcausus*, page 97), "rerum aliae sunt nullius . . . quaedam *universitatis ut theatra*." But his words are not called forth by an eleventh-century situation; they are a quotation from Dig. 1. 8. 6. "*universitatis sunt . . . theatra*."

The process by which these legal residues are deposited is to be seen in the following definition of *scena* which we find in the early thirteenth century jurist Accursius: "*scena est obumbratio cortinarum quae posita sunt in publico vel in privato loco et dicitur scena a scenen quod est corda, quia ioculatores faciunt ire caballos per chordam et similia*" (*Glos. Digest*, III, 2. 3).

Here the term "obumbratio" comes from Servius (*In Aen.*, I., 164): "*scena inumbratio et dicta est scena ἀπὸ τῆς σκιᾶς*." The element: "in publico et in privato loco" is quoted from Labeo (*Digest*, III, II, 2, 25): "*scena ut Labeo definit quae ludorum faciendorum causa . . . in publico privatove . . .*" Then follows the late pseudo-derivation of *scena* from *σχοῖνος* (rope), which is found also in Uguccione: "scenofactor i.e. funium factor et ars scenofactoria unde in Actibus Apostolorum (18) legitur de Paulo quod erat scenofactorie artis." With this development we pass from archeology to actuality and are confronted with an early thirteenth century show of the *balestelli* performed in a tent, on a public square, a feature of which was the rope by which the wooden horses were pulled. This game is fully discussed by the jurist Odofredo (first half of thirteenth century), who says: "Exemplificamus in ludis de *balestelli* qui fiunt quando fit aliqua curia (corte bandita). Nam veniunt ioculatores et ponunt *cortinas (tende)* in aliquo loco et habent equos ligneos et stant intus *cortinas* et faciunt ire caballos per cordas" (Tamasia, *Odofredo*, p. 175).<sup>11</sup>

11. For the game of *equi lignei* see: *Iust. Cod.*, III, 43.

Another example of this stratification of ancient and contemporary layers we find in the following passage from Galvaneus Flamma (early fourteenth century) published by Ceruti, *Misc. Stor. Patr.*, vii, 467:

De amphitheatro civitatis mediolanensis: Amphitheatrum fuit hedifitium rotundum altissimo muro circumspectum [*sic*] habens duas portas . . . Quocienscumque instabat alicuius cause controversia vel criminis impositio non requirebatur iurista aut lex sed illi duo inter quos erat questio *galeis aureis ornati equis albis insidentes alter per orientalem alter per occidentalem* (portam) calcaribus perurgentibus destriarios in tantum astis et gladiis *perseveranter dimicabant quousque alter in alterius mortem prosilleret*. Unde in civitate non fuit opus lege ubi gladius insaniens disputabat . . . et ex hoc Romani principes in arcu triumphali inscribi iusserunt: 'Qui vult modico tempore vivere Mediolanum inhabitet ubi vires pro legibus et iura in ossibus describuntur.'

What we have here is a confusion of actuality, archeology and fiction. The contemporary feature is the unmistakable burgher's dislike for feudal customs, an admiration for Roman law and a general antipathy to the Longobardic tradition. But the story and the picture are unreal. The texts come mainly from Isidore, *Etym.*, 18, 53. (The words exactly taken from Isidore are italicized.)

III. The attempts on the part of medieval authors to explain what actually went on in theaters in pagan days again prove nothing for they offer almost invariably mere repetitions of ancient texts. So the famous passage in Dantis Petrus' commentary to the Divine Comedy (prologue):

Antiquitus in theatro quod erat area semicircularis et in eius medio erat domuncula quae scena dicebatur in qua erat pulpitem et super id ascendebat poeta ut cantor, et sua carmina ut cantiones recitabat. Extra vero erant mimi id est jocolatores carminum pronuntiationem gestu corporis effigiantes per adaptationem ad quemlibet ex cuius persona ipse poeta loquebatur: unde cum loquebatur, pone, de Junone conquerente de Hercule privigno suo mimi, sicut recitabat ita effigiabant Junonem invocare furias infernales ad infestandum ipsum Herculem: et si tale pulpitem seu domunculam ascendebat poeta qui de more villico caneret talis cantus dicebatur comedia.

In other words, we are told that the theater was semicircular; that in it was a little "domus" which was called *scena*; that in this *scena* there was a "pulpitem" which was also called "orchestra"; and that on this *pulpitem* the poets sang their poems and the mimes enacted it by gestures. All of which is taken bodily out of Isidore's *Etymologiae* ("theatrum semicirculi figuram habens," xv, 2.35; "scena erat locus infra theatrum in modum domus instructa cum pulpito qui pulpitus orchestra vocabatur ubi cantabant comici tragici," xviii, 43; "ibi enim [on the orchestra] poetae . . . conscendebant hisque canentibus alii gestus

edebant," xviii, 44; "mimi . . . habebant suum auctorem qui antequam mimum agerent fabulam pronuntiaret," xviii, 49). The only contemporary feature is the example given. It is taken from Seneca's *Hercules Furens* and it shows that Peter had kept up with the progress made in the field of classical scholarship. The closing lines are an abbreviated quotation of a statement that goes back to Diomedes, Donatus and Suetonius.

Boccaccio (and naturally Da Buti) in the prologue to his commentary (*Laterza*, I, 115) agrees mainly with this except that he makes the mimes talk as well as gesticulate. In his commentary to *Inferno* I however (*op. cit.*, p. 144) he seems to fall back upon the accepted position:

Queste cotal commedie poi recitavano [i.e. una spezie di poeti comici] nella scena cioè in una piccola casetta la quale era costituita nel mezzo del teatro, stando dintorno alla detta scena tutto il popolo. E non gli traeva tanto il diletto e il desiderio di udire quanto di vedere i giuochi che dalla recitazione del commedo procedevano; i quali erano in questa forma: che una spezie di buffoni chiamati "mimi" l'ufficio dei quali è sapere contraffare gli atti degli uomini, uscivano di quella scena, informati dal commedo in quegli abiti ch'erano convenienti a quelle persone . . .<sup>12</sup>

Moving backward we find the already quoted passage from the *Graphia* again with the description of Isidore unchanged. The same in the eleventh century Papias. An eleventh century *Vita Terentii* (Westervhovich, I, xxx, III) presents this general situation with, however, an interesting addition: "comedia enim," he says, "ita constabat ut non res gestas more historiarum narret, sed ex colluquutione personarum res gesta comprehendatur quasi inter eos tunc agatur." This commentator, in addition to the *recitator* and the *mimi*, has also a *modulator*.

The definition and description of *scena* is accompanied by a considerable stress on the fact that the word has something to do with "umbra" and "adumbratio" and "unabraculum," etc. But this too is antiquarianism. Pio Rajna (*Studi Danteschi*, IV, 13) seems to think that this is a medieval development. As a matter of fact it goes back to classical antiquity. Servius says (*In Aen.*, I, 164): "scena inumbratio, et dicta scena ἀπὸ τῆς σκιᾶς. Apud antiquos enim theatralis scena parietem non habuit sed de frondibus umbracula quaerebant. . . ." Vitruvius likewise (*De Arch.*, I, 2.2) says: "scenographia est frontis et laterum abscedentium adumbratio." And Cassiodorus (*Variar.*, IV, 51): "Frons autem theatri scena dicitur ab umbra luci densissima ubi a pastoribus inchoante verno diversis sonis carmina cantabantur." This is echoed in the Glossa-

12. The references by Boccaccio to ancient theaters are: *Dec.*, x, 6 Fiammetta, 91, 109, 167 etc.

ries. The most interesting restatement is in Placidus, *Libri Glossarum* (Loewe v, 98): "scena est *camera* hinc inde composita que *inumbat* locum in teatro in quo ludi actitantur; item scena dicitur arborum in se incumbentium quasi concamerata condensatio ut subterpositos tegere possit." The same statement is found in *Codex Parisinus*, *loc. cit.*, p. 148; and with slight variations in the *Libri Romani*, *loc. cit.*, p. 41.

Uguccione likewise tells us s.v. *scenos*: "et a *scenos* quod est umbra dicitur *hec scena*, *scene*, id est umbra et scena id est umbraculum, locus obumbratus in theatro et *cortinis coopertus* similis tabernis mercenariorum que sunt asservis vel cortinis operte. Et secundum hoc scena posset dici a *scenos* quod est *domus* quia in modum domus erat constructa; in illo *umbraculo* latebant persone larvate."

Here the ancient elements reappear with the addition of something drawn from contemporary life. The shade, moreover, is no longer given by the trees but by tents or sheds. And the mimes appear as masks. So again in John of Genoa s.v. *scena*: "in illo *umbraculo* latebant personae larvatae quae ad vocem recitatoris exhibant ad gestos faciendos."<sup>13</sup>

There was however another account of the old theaters which, though completely erroneous, is worth considering. It appears in the *Chronicon Extravagans* of Galvaneus Flamma (thirteenth-fourteenth century) (see Ceruti, *Misc. di Stor. Ital.*, vii, 466): "Teatrum fuit hedificium semicirculare altissimum, fenestratum. Exteriorius erant scalae per quas ascendebatur ad fenestras et totus populus stabat in fenestris exteriorius intus aspiciens." (The theater has windows, the spectators stay outside and look through these windows which they reach by means of external stairways.) What follows is somewhat more orthodox: "In medio theatri erat unum puplitum [*sic*] rotundum ex marmore. In puplito *ystoriones* [*sic*] cantabant aliquas pulcras ystorias bellorum. Finito cantu *ystorionum* adveniebant mimi pulsantes lyras et cytharas et decenti motu corporis se circumvolvebant. Et fuit istud hedificium in loco qui dicitur ecclesia Sancti Victoris ad theatrum sive ad Trenum." Here the place of the *comedus*, of the *poeta* as recitator has been taken by the *histriones*. The "lyras et cytharas" go back to Isidore, *Etym.*, xviii, 47.

13. The word *scena* had early come to mean an *arbor* (*Laube*). Einhart, *Ep.* 57 (*Mon. Ger. Ep.*, v, 138), so treats it and quotes Vitruvius above referred to. In the *Vita S. Anscari*, ch. 19 (*Mon. Ger. Ser.*, ii, 702), we read "scena in campo ad colloquium comparata." Papias s.v. *scena* says "Umbraculum ubi poetae recitabantur quasi lobia." This Longobardic word was kept alive by the Lombards and finally passed into the cultural language of Italy. Gregory of Tours (*De Virt. S. Mart.*, ch. 9) also uses it figuratively but in a different sense: "Hi in scena montis aquosi dependent," where the word seems to have the meaning of *facies*, a usage natural enough, *scena* being considered from the point of view of the spectators. So in Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos*, ch. 20: "coelorum septemplex scenam" (see Apuleius, *Met.*, iv, 20).

The word *ystoriones* (for *ystriones*) should be kept. It is purposely connected with *historia* and this connection goes far back. Isidore has it (*Etym.*, xviii, 48): "dicti autem histriones quod perplexas hystoriis fabulas exprimerent quasi historiones." This connection has noticeable significance in connection with the meanings the word acquired in Italian.

The theatrical terms which we find in medieval texts can be accounted for frequently on purely rhetorical or stylistic grounds. The theater, its parts, its performances were relied upon to furnish metaphors particularly in connection with the commonplace of the tragedy and comedy of life, of the world's stage, etc., which the Middle Ages inherited from the Romans as they in turn had got it from the Greeks. So Aldhelm in *De Virg.* (*Mon. Ger. Auct. Ant.*, xv, 233) speaks of an "Apium . . . *theatrali* quodam spectaculo" and page 253, of an "angelicum coelestis *theatri* consessum." Rhabanus Maurus (*De Univ.*, xx, 36): "Mystice autem theatrum praesentem mundum significare potest . . ." Lambertus Herzfordensis (*Mon. Ger. Script.*, vi, 236) speaks of "lugubrem trajediam toto mundi huius theatro decantandam" and page 242 "deferens secum de vita . . . scenicis figmentis consimilem trajediam."<sup>14</sup>

To this we may add in a somewhat different sense Honorius, *De Gemma Animae*, i, 83 (*M.P.L.*, 172, 570): "Sciendum quod hi qui in *theatris* recitabant, actus pugnantium gestibus populo representabant. Sic tragicus noster pugnam Christi populo Christiano in *theatro* Ecclesiae gestibus suis repraesentat"; which is but an echo and a development of St. Augustine *In Johan.*, chapter i, tr. 7; also of St. Augustine *De Symbolo* (Benedictine edition, vi, 407); of Tertullian *De Spect.*, chapters 29 and 30, and *Ad Mart.*, chapter 3; finally of Pseudo-Cyprian *De Spect.*, 9 and 10.

Similar to this is the use of some of these words in connection with the mannerisms of oratorical delivery. Limiting our attention to *tragedia* we find that in addition to *luctuosum* its standing epithet was some word meaning: "thundering." So Sedulius (*Carm. Pasch.*, i, 18) who speaks of "tragico boatu." Cassiodorus *Var.*, iv, 51, informs us that "tragedia ex vocis vastitate nominatur." This was handed down by the *Glosses* of Placidus (Loewe *C.G.L.*, v, 41): "Tragedia est enim genus carminis quo poetae res . . . *alto sonitu* describunt" and again page 59: "trajedi qui in theatro ducturi [*sic*] sunt alta et *intonanti* voce," which explains expressions such as the following from the Council of Clovesho

14. Cf. Paschasius Radbertus *Praef.*, lib. iii (*Mon. Ger. Ep.*, vi, 143). For a frequent use of *trajedia* see Ekkehardi *IV Casus S. Galli* (*Mon. Ger. Scr.*, ii, 103, 107, 137). Also in John of Salisbury, iii, 8, the long chapter entitled: "de mundana comedia et tragedia."



(Haddan and Stubbs, III, 359) "ut presbiteri . . . in ecclesia non garriant tragico sono."

The use of the words *theatrum*, *theatrales* and the rest then proves nothing as to the existence of the theater. This is brought home to us when we recall that the adjective *theatralis* was regularly used for performances in churches, and was an official designation. See among many instances the following from Innocent III (Lateran Council): "interim ludi fiunt in ecclesiis *theatrales*." (Greg. Decr., III, 1, 12). Likewise the text of the Synod of Trier and Liège (Hartzheim, IV, 17). To conclude therefore that the word *theatralis*, unless some other place is indicated, refers to a theater, would be as reasonable as to say that the verb "sails" when nothing to the contrary is stated implies that we are dealing with a sailing vessel.

IV. The same conclusion is reached if we reverse the process and try to determine from an examination of the medieval texts what places were mentioned as actually used for purposes of amusements.

Starting with Pirminius (*M.P.L.*, 89, 104) we read: "Nullus christianorum neque ad *ecclesiam*, neque in *domibus*, neque in *trivio* nec in ullo loco balationes, cantationes, saltationes jocos et lusa diabolica facere non praesumat." Louis the Pious orders (*Mon. Ger. Leges*, II, 2, 83): "balationes et saltationes, canticaque turpia ac luxuriosa et illa lusa diabolica non faciat nec in *plateis* nec in *domibus* neque in ullo loco." Theganus writing this king's life says (*Mon. Ger. Script.*, II, 895): "procedebant thymelici, scurre et mimi cum coraulis et citharistis ad *mensam* coram eo." Noticeable is Abelard's invective (*Theol. Christ.*, Cousin, II, 445). He assails the bishops, because, he says, "joculatores, saltatores, incantatores cantatores turpium acciunt ad *mensam* totum diem ac noctem." Yet, he adds, the devil is not satisfied "nisi etiam scaenicas turpitudines in *ecclesiam* Dei introducat" where "Veneris celebrantur vigiliae."

King Richard, says Muratori (*Antiq. diss.* 29, v, 150): "Rogerio Hovedeno teste," called over from France "cantores et ioculatores" who were to sing his praises "in *plateis*." About a century later the people of Bologna decreed "ut cantatores francigenorum in *plateis* communis ad cantandum omnino morari non possint." The same in Pierre de Blois, *M.P.L.*, 207, 49. In the *Historia Eliensis Eccl.* (Gale, *Hist. Brit. Scr.*, p. 463) we read that "gentilium figmenta et deliramenta" were "in gymnasiis et scholis publice celebrata." John of Salisbury in the above quoted passage makes it clear that the performances that were indulged in his days were not carried on in buildings for the purpose.

The place mentioned at the Synod of Trier (1227) is the *ecclesia*; at Utrecht (1293) "*ecclesiae et coemeteria*." In the *Statutes* of John, Bishop

of Liège (Hartzheim, III, 693) we read: "praecipimus ut jocolatores, histriones, saltatrices in *ecclesia, coemeterio vel porticu* eiusdem vel in processionibus vel in rogationibus joca vel ludibria non exercent." And as late as the fifteenth century we find the Council of Sens (Mansi, IX, 1525) decreeing that "per choreas, ludos theatrales, ludificationes solent templa domini profanare."

If we turn to some Italian secular performances we reach the same conclusion. Muratori (*Antiq.*, IV, 1126) refers to a "Ludus in Prato Vallis cum gigantibus" at Padua in 1224, and to a "magnus ludus de quodam homine salvatico" (page 1130) in the same place (in the year 1209, as we gather from the *Lib. reg. Pad.*). The *Cronica Rolandini* (Mur., *Rer. it. scr.*, new ed., cap. 10) gives a full description of an elaborate pageant and masquerade, enacted likewise in "Prato Vallis" at Padua.

Omitting many such performances recorded in medieval writings, we might refer to one which deserves special notice. It took place in 1214 at Treviso in an open square where a temporary mock castle was erected for the occasion. Rolandini in his Chronicle describes the "revue" as follows (chapter 13):

"De ludo quodam facto apud Tarvisium . . . anno scilicet MCC XIV. ordinata est quedam curia (corte bandita) solacii et leticie . . . *factum est enim ludicrum quoddam castrum* in quo posite domine cum virginibus . . . que sine alicuius viri auxilio castrum prudentissime defenderunt." This mock castle, defended by ladies and damsels, was fortified with the following materials: "variis et griseis et cendatis, purpuris samitis et ricellis scarlatis et baldachinis et armerinis." The ladies had for helmets golden crowns with precious stones. The attack was made with the following weapons: "pomis, datalis et muscatis, tortellis, piris et coctanis, rosis, liliis et violis," also perfumes and spices of many sorts. Venice sent a goodly troop which, carrying "Sancti Marchi preciosum vexillum, prudenter et delectabiliter pugnauerunt." Unfortunately a real fight developed and the show had to be suspended by the umpire.

A century later (1304) the Florentines staged their famous and disastrous spectacle of the Hereafter on the bridge of the Carraia, with the painter Buffalmacco aiding in the building of the *pulpita*.

V. Conversely every time a theater building is mentioned the reference is clearly to ancient times.

So in Honorius, *M.P.L.*, 172, 1243: "Sciendum quod hi qui in teatro *recitabant*, actus pugnantium gestibus *repraesentebant*." So in Hugo of St. Victor, *Erud. did.*, II, 28 (*M.P.L.*, 176, 762): "Theatrica dicitur scientia ludorum a theatro, quo populus ad ludendum convenire *solebat*." So again, in the same author's *Except. Priores*, I, 21 (*M.L.P.*, 177, 201):



"ludorum alii *fiebant* in theatris . . . in theatris gesta *recitabantur*." So in St. Thomas, *IV Sent. dist.*, 16 qu. 4, art 3: "quidam enim ludi sunt qui in theatris *agebantur*." So Pseudo-Thomas (Fretté 32.438): "Scena locus umbrosus in teatro ubi *abscondebantur* personae pronuntiantes carmina tragica vel comica." When however St. Thomas spoke of contemporary amusements and delivered his memorably liberal views on shows then he used the present tense: "ludus *est* necessarius ad conversationem humanae vitae. Ad omnia autem quae sunt utilia conversationi humanae deputari possunt aliqua officia licita. Et ideo etiam officium istrionum quod ordinatur ad solatium hominibus exhibendum non est secundum se illicitum. . . ." But this applies to the *ludi* in the places we have been considering.

These texts show, it seems to me, that from the use of theatrical words found in Professor Loomis' quotations we may not draw any conclusion as to the existence of the theater. He has another argument however and that is the description of a show in an actual theater drawn from Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum* (Hewlet, II, 24).

Unfortunately the show therein described is an imaginary one seen in a vision. It represents the devils amusing themselves in the next world torturing the damned in a place which looks like the ruins of an ancient theater.

We have here an example of a very ancient *genre*: Judgment Day described as a theatrical show. Tertullian already has it (*De Spect.*, 29, 30): "quale autem *spectaculum* in proximo est adventus Domini . . . et tamen per fidem spiritu imaginante *repraesentata*." He then proceeds to place in this imagined fiery hell kings, poets, actors and the like.<sup>15</sup>

The ingenious and original trait of Roger of Wendover's vision is that the imagined diabolical tortures are set in a place which has always been regarded by Christians as a favorite abode of the Devil—the Theater.<sup>16</sup>

The unreal traits of this vision are obvious; the walls are *ferrei*; the blazing seats are also of iron. The only conclusion therefore we can draw from the passage is that the author knew something of the existence of ancient theaters and their use, which of course was to be expected. In order to use it as an argument for the actual existence of theaters we should have to assume that the acts, persons and things of a vision must of necessity belong to the time in which the vision takes place.

15. For Judgment Day Tertullian uses the image of another ancient place of amusement: the gymnasium. He says (*Ad Mart.*, ch. 3): "Bonum agmen subituri estis in quo Agonothetes Deus vivus est; Xystarchus spiritus Sanctus."

16. For a late and mock reference to this belief, cf. the famous Coliseum scene in Benvenuto Cellini's *Autobiography*.

VI. Professor Cohen's commentary on this vision brings out the elements of actuality which naturally would be introduced in a vision of this sort. There is something, however, in his discussion that, if it means what it seems to say, must be very sharply questioned. He tells us (pages 96-97): "This association of the word *theatricus* with religious plays removes many of our doubts in interpreting *theatrum* in Ailred as a theatre in the *classical sense of the word, that is to say an amphitheatre*." To make matters worse Professor Cohen after identifying the theater with the amphitheater carries the confusion one step further (page 98) and speaks of a "*circus-shaped theatre*." Thus the so often mentioned show places of antiquity are reduced from four to one.

Of course there is nothing better established in the architecture and in the social life of antiquity than the distinction between *theatrum*, *amphitheatrum* and *circus* and it might seem otiose even to discuss the matter. However, since this question has come up before and has given rise to what seem to be misinterpretations and unnecessary emendations of texts it might not be amiss to present certain facts and discuss their meaning.

Tertullian enumerates and describes the four different show places of ancient Rome, viz. 1. *circus* (hippodromus), 2. *theatrum*, 3. *stadium* (agon, *xystos*, *gymnasium*), 4. *amphitheatrum* (arena) in as many chapters of his *De Spectaculis*, viz. 16, 17, 18, 19. He repeats this enumeration in the 20th chapter of the same work and takes them up anew in *Apol.*, 38.4. In *De Spect.*, 30 he transfers the four of them to the next world.

The distinction therefore between the places (1) where races took place, (2) those where dramas were read or performed, (3) those where gladiatorial battles were waged and (4) those where athletic contests were held, was clear to everybody. Isidore saved these distinctions for posterity. He says, correctly (*Etym.*, xviii, xvi, 3): "*Ludus autem aut gymnicus aut circensis aut gladiatorius aut scenicus*." In Chapter 59 of the cited book however, he sums up the genus with the four species in describing the moral filth connected in each and gives us five instead of four. Lupus of Ferrières (*Mon. Ger. Ep.*, vi, 115) refers to them correctly: "*Ludi aut gymnici aut gladiatorii aut circenses aut scenici nominabantur*." Aldelmus mentions them in *De Metris* (*Mon. Ger. Auct. Ant.*, xv, 166), but confusedly. They are remembered in the intervening centuries and reappear in Helinand (*De Rep. Laps.*): "*non scena, non circus, non amphitheatrum non ampicircus*," where the *stadium* has become the *amphicircus*.

When we turn to Hugo of St. Victor we encounter them along with contemporary forms in the usual blend of past lore and actual doings.

He says (*Erud. Did.*, II, 28): "Theatrica dicitur scientia ludorum a theatris quo populus ad ludendum convenire solebat. Fiebant autem ludi alii in *theatro*, alii in atriis, alii in *gymnasiis*, alii in *amphicircis*, alii in *arenis*, alii in conviviis, alii in fanis." The circus has here become the amphicircus, with the meaning, however, fairly well maintained. For he says: "In amphicircis cursu certabant vel pedum vel equorum, vel curruum." And again (*Except. Priores*, I, 21) "Ludorum alii in theatris, alii in gabulis, alii in gymnasiis."

The stadium dropped out. In St. Jerome we already have but three: "arena saeviat, circus insaniat, theatra luxurient" (*Epist.* 43, 3). That this threefold division is becoming a real one and is not merely a case of literary exemplification can be seen by referring to the official utterance of Justinian (*Novella* 105, 1), which in the Latin version (the Authenticum) reads as follows: "haec autem a nobis determinentur in circensibus, et bestiarum spectaculis, et thymeleis delectatione." Du Cange (s.v. *balisteum*) believes he finds these three places in a French text as translations, he says, of leg. 9 cap. *De feriis*: "aut scena theatralis, aut circense spectaculum, aut ferarum lachrymosa spectacula."

Each of these places had its patron devil: Mars for the arena, Mercury for the stadium; for the circus Neptune, for the theater Liber and Venus (Isidore, Tertullian, Salvianus, *et al.*). Each one of them got its standing epithets and its attributes of opprobrium: *insania* or *mania* belongs to the circus; to the "saeva arena" was assigned "immisericordia" (Tertullian *et al.*). The "theatrum" is more generously endowed. Some of the commonest names connected with it are: "impudicitia, spurcitia, impuritas, turpitudine, licentia, luxuria, foeditas, obscenitas." Naturally the gymnasium was let off easily with such phrases as "vanitas xysti."

The difference in shape between Theatrum and Amphitheatrum is given approximately enough by Isidore, XVIII, II, 2: "Amphitheatrum rotundum est, theatrum vero ex medio amphitheatro est semicirculi figuram habens." These words are frequently quoted, as we saw above. They are again met with when the term "arena" replaces "amphitheatrum," and "harengum" in turn displaces "arena." Galvaneus Flamma (*Chronicon Majus*, 43) says "Inter ecclesiam majorem et ecclesiam Sancte Thecle fuit quoddam aedificium dictum arena, nunc dicitur Arengum et erat rotundum et magnum," and Bentius of Alessandria (was in Holy Land 1284) in the opusculum *De Civitate Mediol.* (from his *Chronicon*) published by Ferrai in *Bull. Istituto Stor. Ital.*, IX (1890), p. 15, says: "Arena quae est arengum erat . . . rotunda in cuius circuito erant camerae quot in anno sunt dies per occultos meatus inclusae." Of course the forms were not quite as described by these authors: the amphitheater was elliptical; the theater normally consisted of semi-

circular rows of seats (the *cavea*) concentric with the semicircle of the orchestra and facing the stage. The circus was a space enclosed within two parallel *straight* lines, one slightly longer than the other, connected at one end by a semicircle and at the other by a curve whose cord was not perpendicular to the rectilinear sides.

These distinctions were perpetuated in the toponymy of the medieval cities and it has been possible to locate buried structures by the names surviving in the localities where they once stood. So for instance in Milan we have the "Ecclesia Sancti Victoris ad Theatrum," built close to the site where the Roman theater stood until 1162. The amphitheater of Milan was early lost sight of. When excavations began a few years ago the men in charge proceeded to make minor assays in the locality called *Via Arena*. What they unearthed was enough to convince them that they had found part of an elliptical wall. They then proceeded to calculate the dimensions of the ellipse, determine its curvature and thus reduce the work of excavating to a minimum: viz. to the spots pre-established by calculations. All of which turned out successfully.<sup>17</sup>

The same situation obtained in connection with the circus. Excavations were again guided by the existence of the old church, "Ecclesia Sanctae Mariae ad Circulum" (Santa Maria al Cerchio), that pointed to the existence of the *Circus* in the proximity. Excavations again led to the unearthing of parts of the rectilinear walls, of the connecting semicircle, and finally of the oblique *carceres*.<sup>18</sup>

The names of the *theatrum* and *amphitheatrum* were often confused in common parlance. New terms arose, some of them limited to certain buildings. "Arena" remained the commonest term for the amphitheater; regularly so at Verona, Capua, Nîmes, etc. The term Labyrinthus was occasionally used as substitute; see the eighth century *Descriptio Veronae* in Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Scr.*, II, 2, 1095, which says: "Habet autem Labyrinthum magnum per circuitum" (cf. Maffei *Istoria dei diplomi*).

More frequent was the term Colosseum, Colyseum, Colossum and the like. So naturally at Rome, so at Verona, so at Capua. In the last place we have very interesting developments. Erchempert in his late ninth century *Historia Lang. Benev.* gives us ample information on the subject. In chapter 41 he calls it *Berelais* ("Adveniens Berelais hoc est amphitheatrum"). So again in chapter 40 ("Berelais et Suessam"). In chapter 44 he calls it *Colossum*: "super Colossum quo filii Landonis degebant insedit illos . . . qui residebant in thermis iuxta arenam . . .

17. See A. Calderini, *L'Anfiteatro*, etc. (1940).

18. See Alberto de Capitani d'Arzago, *Il Circo Romano* (1939).

filiis Landonis in Amphitheatro circumseptis." Again in chapter 73: "Hinc inchoavit omnia sata eorum qui in *Colossum* morabantur diripere." Owing to this name the leader of the troops defending the amphitheater bore the title of *Colossensis* and his soldiers were called *theatrales*: "ille vero sugerente hoc vel maxime Guaiferio *Colossense* ex abditis Grecos Neapolites una cum *theatralibus* viris . . ." (chapter 56).

The term *Berelais* was changed to *Vorolasu* (A. Di Meo, *Annali del Regno di Napoli*, iv, 253) and finally became *Verlasci*, in which form it still lives today. The word itself *Berelais* is well established. It became the name of an Episcopal See (*Epist.* 273 of Pope John VIII: *Mon. Ger. Epist.*, v, 242, 246). The catalogue of the Counts of Capua (*Scr. Rerum Lang.*, p. 449) says: "inditione 6, post dies 11 capitur *Berelais* a domno Atenolfo."

This seems to be the same word as *Parlascium*<sup>19</sup> (*parlascio*, *pirolascio*, *perilascium*, etc.) so frequently referred to in Tuscany: Lucca, Florence, Pisa and elsewhere.<sup>20</sup> For Lucca see *Mem. e Doc. Lucch.*, iv, 1, p. 199: "Iuxta theatrum quod *Parlascium* vocant" (a. 808). This place came to be called: "Le prigioni vecchie." For Florence see Davidsohn, *Storia di Firenze*, II, 1023. This place came to be used as a prison and was called *Burrelle*. (Is the word connected with *Berelais*?) Dante was reminded of these dark, man-made caverns when he was groping through natural dungeons, back from the center to the surface of the earth. A Tuscan village that grew around an Arena came to be called *Parlascio* (see Repetti s.v.).

The term *Theatrum* likewise had interesting vicissitudes. It was changed to:

1. *Zatrum*;<sup>20</sup> cf. *Mirabilia (Codex Pragensis)*, *Ulrichs Codex*, etc., p. 135: "theatrum Pompei, juxta palatium eius, ubi dicitur *Zatro*."

2. to *Zadrum*<sup>20</sup> (*Cod. dipl. Padovano*, I, 259 [a. 1079], 304).

3. to *Jadrum*;<sup>20</sup> *Maffei degli Anf.*, lib. II, cap. 16: "habet ibi [Pola] duo antiqua palatia scilicet *Iadrum* et *Harenam*."

4. *Azadrum* (see below).

5. *Zairum*. This word was used throughout the Middle Ages and in modern times to indicate a place in Padua which had long ceased to be connected with the ancient theater. Muratori quotes documents in which it appears but does not try to define it. Du Cange incorporates one of Muratori's texts but he too fails to define or derive the term. Yet the text is very clear in that it describes the main use which Roman theaters in the Middle Ages were put to, viz. that of a marble quarry:

19. The usual derivation is from: *Palatium*.

20. The word is not in Du Cange.

"ut concedas mihi fodere de Zairo aliquas petras" (Placit ann. 1077 apud Murat. *Antiq.*, I, 457).

The failure to identify these forms has caused scholars to read texts erroneously and introduce new words in the vocabulary.

Ughelli (*Italia Sacra*, II, 187), publishing a false *charta* of Charles le Gros which exists in a twelfth-century "copy," prints the word: "Azidium." Again on page 203 he has it but in the form of: "Azadium." Du Cange takes both of these over without change or definition. The text however was correctly read by Affò (*St. Parm. I App.*, xxii, 298) as follows: "*arenam, carnarium azadrum, publica pascua* etc."

Muratori (*Ant. diss.* 19, II, 73) quotes a "*confirmatio privilegiorum . . . episcopo Patavino . . . ab Henrico IV*" as follows: "*nominatim quoque Ladrum cum pratis et pontem cum arcubus*." Where, again, the correct reading is: *Zadrum*. Migne, *P.L.*, 151, 1149, reproduces the document with the erroneous reading.

A diploma of the year 1090 reads in the copy of Gloria (*Cod. Dipl. Pad.*, 328-329) as follows: "*Arenam quoque cum satyro* etc." And scholars have tried to discover some ancient theatrical structure called *satyrum*. This form may be due to a scribe who not understanding *Zatrum* replaced it by a reading that seemed to suit the context.

VII. When these buildings ceased to be used as places of spectacles, which is a question raised by Professor Cohen, it is hard to say. St. Augustine tells us, *De Cons. Evang.*, I, 33: "*Per omnes civitates cadunt theatra*"; but things did not move, as all know, very fast. Usually the last example of some sort of a show in an ancient theater is supposed to have been at Barcelona in the reign of Sisebut and with the authorization of Bishop Eusebius. Du Meril (*Orig.*, page 13) refers to this event and quotes the following passage which he attributes to Mariana: "*Quod in theatro quaedam agi concessisset [i.e. episcopus] quae ex vana deorum superstitione traducta aures christianae abhorreere videantur*." E. K. Chambers (*The Medieval Stage*, I, 21, n. 4) tells us that he cannot find "in Sisebut or in Mariana who writes Spanish the words quoted by Du Meril," which is doubly remarkable. For in the first place Mariana did publish his history in Latin: in 20 books (1592); in 25 books (1595); in 30 books in 1606. Also the passage quoted by Du Meril is to be found in the Latin version (De Hondt, I, 203) as well as in the Spanish, in the spot where one would naturally look for it, viz. in the three pages devoted to Sisebut.

Most of the arenas were turned into fortresses, then used as quarries; the underground parts became prisons and finally disappeared. A few of them remained standing. That of Verona was for a while



turned into a tournament camp. At the Colosseum of Rome bull fights held in the early fourteenth century were brought to an end by the tragic events of 1332. (See *Annali di Ludovico Monaldeschi*, in Muratori, *Rer. it. scr.*, x, 2, 535.) Later it came to be used for the passion plays of the Compagnia del Gonfalone.

Much has been written on these sacred performances in the Colosseum and some misinformation has found its way into standard works. The *Compagnia del Gonfalone* started to produce its passion plays in the Flavian Amphitheatre in the closing years of the fifteenth century. These performances came to an end in 1522. They were taken up again in 1525; suspended by the Sack of Rome and forbidden in 1539 by Paul III. An attempt in 1561 to resume them was followed by an order in the same year that put an end to them permanently. (See documents in Mons. Vattasso, *Per la storia*, etc., and Ruggeri, *L'Arciconfraternita del Gonfalone*.)<sup>21</sup>

VIII. It is not sufficient, however, to dispose of the above mentioned arguments for there are certain texts, which I will now produce, which might point to the existence of theaters in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Some of these texts we can explain by recalling that *theatrum* meant *market*, or *market square*, for which see Du Cange s.v., also Bartal *Glossarium*, etc., s.v., and Fumagalli *Antichità Longobardico-Milanesia*, I, 165.

There are others, however, that cannot be explained away on this ground.

The references, for instance, to the *theatrum* of Milan anterior to 1162 become meaningless if we follow Fumagalli's explanation (endorsed by Pertile) and say that its meaning is that of an open market. The theater was still standing when Barbarossa ordered the destruction of the city. It was either demolished by his forces, or immediately afterwards by the Milanese themselves in the endeavor to get materials with which to rebuild their city and its defenses. We gather this from Gunther's *Ligurinus*, a book which we can confidently accept as genuine, and from the *argumentum* to Book vii which though slightly inaccurate in its topography is none the less authentic. He says: "speculatur providus Urbem Caesar et antiqui *theatri* procul aspicit arces." A document of the year 1130 dated "civitate Mediolani in *theatro* publico ipsius civitatis" (*Arch. Catt. Bergamo*, I, IX, A) shows that the building was indeed standing though used for administrative purposes. Calchi, moreover, in his *Historia Patria*, VII (a. 1119: Graevius, II, 209) confirms

21. The information given on the subject by J. H. Parker in "The Roman Amphitheatre" p. 29 is mostly inaccurate.

this when he says of an event of 1119: "qui populum in *theatro* sedentem (durabat enim adhuc antiquissimi operis usus), etc."

In view of all this what does Landulphus Senior (eleventh century) mean when he says: "Harembaldus . . . quasi solus dux, *theatrum*, suos confortando ac cohortando ad bellum, regens, praelii necessaria ordinabat . . . His itaque compositis praecepit militibus ut armati in *theatro* dato signo convenirent" (*Mediol. Hist.*, III, 29; *Murat., Rer. it. scr.*, IV, 117)? It seems as though the *theatrum* had been turned into a fortress, which of course regularly happened in the case of the amphitheaters.

Landulphus Junior (1137) furnishes new difficulties and also an important clue. He says (*Hist. Mediol.*, chapter 31, in *Mon. Ger. Scr.*, xx) "in prato Sancto quod dicitur Brolium ubi archiepiscopus et consules duo *theatra* constituunt; in uno archiepiscopus . . . in altero consules." *Theatrum* here is equivalent to "platform," a meaning which is borne out by another passage of the same author when, referring to the synod of Rome of 1116, he says: "Jordanus vero coram ipsa Synodo *theatrum* ascendit et ibi ad pedes apostolici stratus . . . gratiam et virgam pontificalem in ipso *theatro* suscepit."

These texts may help us to interpret the following from Caesarius of Heisterbach (*De Miraculis Dist.*, x, cap. 28): "De theatro in Saxonia fulminato. Sacerdos quidam de Saxonia nuper mihi retulit miraculum stupendum. . . Hoc, inquit, anno [a. 1222] in terra nostra, in quodam *theatro* fulminati sunt viginti homines solo sacerdote evadente." And the following (Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, III, 38): "in Hertene villa dyocesis Coloniensis dives quidam arietem sericis vestitum malo imposuit atque juxta *theatrum* erexit." Follows the description of an idolatrous rite of buck worship, for which cf. the Longobardic practice referred to by Gregory the Great (*Dial.*, III, 28). A description by Caesarius of the same Germanic rite (Hilka, *op. cit.*, p. 39) may help to further clarify the situation: "Oliverus [died 1227] scholasticus Coloniensis cum ante aliquot annos per villam quandam transiret arietem vidit erectum et circa illum, choream cum canticis et musicis instrumentis, etc."

*Theatrum* then seems to be equivalent in the eleventh, twelfth and early thirteenth centuries to "scaffolding," "platform." This sense is borne out a century later by the following passage from Mussato's *De Gestis Italic. IX intr.*, where he tells us the reasons that made him change from prose to verse: "et solere etiam inquitis [*i.e.* you notaries] amplissima regum ducumque gesta, quo se vulgi intelligentiis conferant pedum syllabarumque mensuris variis linguis in vulgares traduci sermones et in *theatris* et *pulpitis* cantilenarum modulatione proferri." The identity of *theatris* and *pulpitis* above established is here maintained. We



find it in an author of the eighteenth century, Concina (*Maffei dei Teatri*, page 70) who says "at nostri circulatores qui . . . in plateis publicis tabulata seu *pulpita* seu *theatra* vocare vis, erigunt et populo spectacula praebeant"; and in the last century the people of the Tuscan countryside still called the half dozen planks on which the *maggi* were played: the "teatro."

Another passage must also be considered because it has recently again been utilized. It is from Muratori (*Antiq. Ital. diss.* 29) and states: "In Chronico Msto Mediolanensi quod anonymus quidam ex aliis chronicis consarcinavit *antiquum* Mediolanensium *theatrum* describitur super quo Histriones cantabant sicut modo cantantur [*sic*] de Rolando et Oliverio."

Pio Rajna in his article: *Il Teatro di Milano etc.* (*Arch. Stor. Lomb.*, xiv) was able to clear the matter. He discovered what the chronicles were from which this anonymous proceeded. He gave us the ancient texts which did away entirely with the notion of an ancient theater used for dramatic purposes.

These texts were primarily from the early fourteenth-century historian Galvaneus Flamma. It is sufficient to quote one of them from the *Cronica Major* (*op. cit.*, p. 17): "In loco ubi nunc est ecclesia Sancti Victoris ad Trenum sive ad *theatrum* fuit quoddam hedifitium semicirculare dictum theatrum. . . . In medio theatri erat unum puplitum [*sic*] altum super quod historiones cantabant aliquas pulcras et virtuosas ystorias sicut nunc in *foro* cantatur de Rolando et Oliverio."

The theater of Muratori's anonymous has disappeared and the *forum* has taken its place. De Bartholomaeis (*op. cit.*, p. 27, note 2), who does not seem to know about the article of Rajna and the original texts published by him, still refers us to the passage in Muratori above quoted as though it had not completely lost its value.

Less easy to explain is the following from *Vita Sancti Brunonis Querfordensis* (1009—Kauffmann): "adhuc puer . . . more solito pedibus superius calciatis plantis vero desubtus penitus denudatis in secretiori loco *theatri* stabat. Oculis ac manibus in celum fideliter intendebat, circumstrepentes et ignicis [lege: gimnicis] ludisque *theatricis* occupatos proximos ac sodales minime reputans nec attendens." We obviously have here a private gymnasium and sports building. The passage may receive some light by the following from Lambert of Ardres (1203) in his *Hist. Com. Ghisn.* (*Mon. Ger. Scr.*, xxiv, 597): "muros autem infra quorum ambitum pugiles et athletas sepius conflitantes aspeximus" speaking of structures that were then being built.

IX. It seems therefore as though the utilization of a text from a medieval author becomes valid for historical purposes only after the

history of the passage and the value of its terms are known. We can see what hasty conclusions could be reached by the uncritical use of the following text from the Appendix to Hugo of St. Victor, *De Bestiis*, II, chapter 32 (*M.P.L.*, 177, 78): "sic et illi qui deliciis huius *saeculi* et pompis et theatralibus voluptatibus delectantur tragediis et comediis dissoluti velut gravi somno sopiti adversariorum praeda efficiuntur. . . ." We might be presented with tragedies in the twelfth century.

So when we read in the medieval documents of Verona the phrase "ire ad theatrum" we might decide that there was here some sort of an amusement. But in reality the people there considered were going to kill or to be killed, as we gather when we come across the fuller statement which is the following (see *Maffei degli Anfiteatri*, 149): "ire ad theatrum pro custodiendo battaiam cum hominibus armatis."

DINO BIGONGIARI

*Columbia University*

## THE IMPENITENCE OF FRANÇOIS VILLON

IT HAS LONG BEEN CUSTOMARY to think of François Villon as a great sinner who was truly remorseful and penitent on occasion. To be sure, since Siciliano put the famous phrase "je ris en pleurs" in its proper setting critics have recognized this contemporaneous cliché as a suitable *contrevérité* among the many others of the *Ballade du concours de Blois* rather than as the poet's description of himself. Nevertheless the romantic and sentimental conception of a Villon who wept over his sins and bitterly regretted them still persists. In the early days Marcel Schwob spoke of the *Testament* as "une œuvre de repentir" and Gaston Paris believed that at times Villon "se repentait de tout son cœur," that "les remords lui déchiraient le cœur." More recently Champion called the poet's soul "repentante et insolente à la fois." Siciliano himself says that Villon experienced "le remords du péché et du crime" and sees him as "un pécheur repantant." Cons refers to "ses repentances les plus amères" and contrasts "le Villon réel, un raillard pas mal cynique" with "le Villon vrai 'changé en lui-même,' grand, quasi pur."<sup>1</sup>

But did Villon ever regret his sins? Was he ever contrite about what he himself had done? The tragic implications of his life and works seem to me to lie in the very fact that though he knew what was right, he weakly did what was wrong and with no regret whatsoever for his sins but only for the punishment visited upon him because of them. The poet is filled with self-pity, not remorse; he blames others, not himself, for his misfortunes. He knows well that all men are sinners and that sins can be washed away by penitence, that if he truly repents, God will forgive him. But there is little evidence that, despite this knowledge, he himself was ever a contrite and tortured sinner, admitting his guilt and promising to sin no more. He may acknowledge a few peccadilloes, but he rejoices inordinately when he escapes their

1. See M. Schwob in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, cxii (1892), 412; G. Paris, *François Villon*, Paris, 1901, p. 79; P. Champion, *François Villon*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1933, II, 79; Siciliano, *François Villon*, Paris, 1934, pp. 100, 105-106; L. Cons, *État présent des études sur Villon*, Paris, 1936, pp. 15, 136. However, it should be noted that the conception of a penitent Villon does not appear before the nineteenth century. It is first found in embryo in the romanticist, Théophile Gautier, later full-fledged in the apologist, Campaux. It derives, I think, partly from a desire to defend the poet, partly from Villon's phrase, "je ris en pleurs," partly from other expressions in his works which are discussed below. Critics of Villon throughout the ages, whether condemnatory or exonerative, have been influenced to an unusual degree by moral considerations (see Cons, *op. cit.*, *passim* and N. Edelman, *RHL*, XLIII [1936], 211, 321). Even today, reading D. B. Wyndham Lewis after Stevenson is much like reading Campaux after Sainte-Beuve.

consequences and indulges in self-pity only when caught, blaming poverty, necessity, the stars, fate and other persons, never himself, for whatever he may have done.<sup>2</sup> An examination of his works will perhaps make this evident.

## I

In the *Lais* the targets of Villon's wit are harshly, even cruelly, lampooned, but the poet does not yet feel obliged to excuse himself, and there is nothing in this work that anyone could regard as betraying a consciousness of guilt. Villon leaves various rich men some equivocal and humorously unneeded legacies with no obvious bitterness regarding their wealth or his own poverty. Indeed though at the end he professes to have very little money left after making his bequests, throughout the poem he has played the role of a well-endowed patron, pretending to give away swords, hauberks, *tentes et pavillons*. He innocently justifies the making of his will by the uncertainties incident to a projected journey, and the journey itself is attributed to nothing more serious than the behavior of his false lady.<sup>3</sup>

It is the *Testament*, however, that is usually regarded as his "œuvre de repentir." Obviously in this poem Villon feels very sorry for himself and attempts to find excuses for his misfortunes, but, so far as I can see, he professes neither guilt nor remorse. He pities himself as a poor little clerk deprived of the steadying influence of some rich Alexander, disavowed by his own people, abused by his enemies, hungry, lean and old before his time because of mistreatment. He is deeply concerned with death and the ravages of time. He ascribes his troubles to Bishop Thibault d'Aussigny, to the rigors of the law, to poverty, necessity, his false love, all the curs who have made him suffer. But does he say *peccavi*? A dispassionate reading of the work will hardly reveal the sinner torn by remorse so universally posited by our critics.

Villon knows that the Church tells us to pray for our enemies, but he prays only an equivocal prayer for his, actually cursing him (*Testament*, lines 16 ff.), and when he comes to praising the Son and Mother

2. The difference between Villon and a true medieval penitent emerges with startling vividness from a comparison between his words and those, for example, of Rutebeuf, especially in the latter's *Repentance* and his *Miracle de Théophile*, lines 384 ff. Br. Leo Charles Yedlicka in "Expressions of the Linguistic Area of Repentance and Remorse in Old French," *Cath. U. Studies in Rom. Lang. and Lit.*, xxvii, 1945, cites only four instances from Villon. Of these one is dubiously interpreted (pp. 40, 356), a second refers to the wealthy dead, not the poet himself (p. 327), and the other two, which I discuss below, indicate no true repentance on Villon's part. Theological distinctions between contrition, attrition, etc., are interestingly discussed by Br. Leo Charles, but need not concern us here since they play no role in modern conceptions of the poet as a penitent.

3. On Villon's journey to Angers and its bearing on the *Lais* see *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 154 ff.

of God, it is for their help—and especially that of King Louis—in getting him out of trouble (49 ff.). He may say (105 ff.) “je suis pecheur, je le sçay bien,” but he adds at once that God does not wish his death, only his conversion to the paths of righteousness and that if conscience stings him, even though he die in sin, God will pardon him. However, this is a large “if” which seems never to have been fulfilled, for he immediately states that, were the public weal to profit by his death, he would condemn himself, and then he expressly denies any guilt by insisting that on the contrary, dead or alive, he hurts neither young nor old (121–126). A little later he again exculpates himself and smilingly emphasizes his innocence by saying, “qui n’a mesfait ne le doit dire” (192).

To be sure, he admits that if he had studied in his foolish youth and dedicated himself to good conduct, he might now have his own house and a soft couch; alas, he adds, he fled school like a naughty child and in writing these words his heart almost breaks (201–208). Even while he pretends to weep over his lost youth, so soon departed, he admits that he had a better time than others (169–170). Are these the thoughts of a contrite sinner, as is so often held? Does a penitent pretend to be broken-hearted over playing hooky and over failure through bad behavior to earn a comfortable bed? Is Villon really weeping over his lost youth here? Viewed in their context his tears have all the jesting mockery of some crocodile variety.

He soon speaks of himself as unfit to act as judge and vows that “de tous suis le plus imparfait,” but it is obvious that this is feigned humility, as Thuasne rightly assumes, since “Loué soit le doux Jhesu Crist” immediately follows (259 ff.; cf. Thuasne’s edition, II, 136). When later (294) Villon calls himself “pecheur” it is only in the general sense that all men are sinners. The “povre viellart” addressed in 424 who is prevented from committing some horrible deed by fear of God may or may not be Villon (critics differ); he is in any case no penitent.

As Villon begins the series of his actual bequests (833 ff.) he commends his soul to the Trinity and Nostre Dame, praying that it may be brought before the Throne, but he makes no confession of guilt. He admits that his “plus que pere,” Guillaume de Villon, has pulled him out of many a scrape (849 ff.) and that his poor mother has had bitter sorrow and much sadness because of him, but he implies no serious misdemeanors, nothing worse than the students’ fracas over the Pet au Deable. So too when he says that his attorney, Fournier, has won many a suit for him, he carefully adds that his cases were always just (1030 ff.). Of course the avowal of *paillardise* in the cynical *Ballade de la*

*Grosse Margot* (1591 ff.) is accompanied by not a trace of remorse: "nous deffuyons onneur, il nous deffuit."

In the *Belle leçon aux enfants perdus* and the following *Ballade de bonne doctrine* (*Testament*, 1668 ff.) there is plenty of good advice sardonically offered: penitence comes too late if one gets caught and dies in infamy, a man is foolish to risk his life for so little, ill-gotten gains profit no one, etc.<sup>4</sup> But then comes the mocking refrain that it makes no difference whether a man gains profit by good means or bad, in the end everything goes to the taverns and wenches. If Villon's heart is here torn with consciousness of sin, he manages without difficulty to conceal his wounds.

Villon frankly wishes posterity to think of him as a *bon follastre*, a good wanton, foolish and ribald but not criminal, and he pictures himself as a poor scholar unjustly driven into exile despite an appeal for clemency (1883 ff.). Before closing the testament he begs for the grace of an odd assortment of persons—monks, mendicants, fops, light women, brawlers, showmen—but definitely excludes and curses his enemies, the traitorous dogs who have made him suffer: let their ribs be crushed with heavy mallets (1968 ff.). And in the very last *ballade* concluding the whole poem he returns to his self-portrait of the *bon follastre*, pretending to die as a martyr of love, yet none the less, merry as a marlin, drinking a draught of good red wine as he leaves this world.

Now the *Testament* was written after Villon had murdered a man, however inadvertently, after he had remained in exile some seven months before being pardoned for this deed, after he had fallen foul of the law again by robbing the Collège de Navarre and had again gone into exile, after he had been associated with proved criminals, some of whom were hung for their crimes and whose language he wrote, after he had languished in the prison of Bishop Thibault for some unknown offense, possibly under sentence of death, and had been released only by a general freeing of prisoners at the time of King Louis's entry into Meung.<sup>5</sup> The work exhibits bitterness toward his foes, a wide-ranging preoccupation with death, a tendency to make excuses for himself and to complain about his fate, but no sorrow for his evil life, no self-reproach, unless an unconvincing lament for his lost youth and references to the trouble caused his mother and protector can be so regarded. He regrets his own suffering, but he blames others, not himself, for it. Of

4. For a fuller discussion of these poems see below, Part II.

5. The preoccupation with death may imply concern for the friends who had been executed and for the possibility of his sharing their fate. Champion, *op. cit.*, II, 105, believes a sentence of death was imposed upon Villon in 1460 while he was supposedly in prison in Orléans, but others doubt this. Cf. the views of Charlier and Foulet cited with those of the author in *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 498 ff. On *boire ses hontes* see *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 509.

true contrition and recantation our cynical *bon follastre* betrays no evidence.<sup>6</sup>

His attitude toward himself emerges most clearly in the *Debat du cuer et du corps de Villon*, written when he was thirty years old and therefore at approximately the same time as the *Testament*, perhaps a little earlier.<sup>7</sup> Villon shows here that he realizes he *ought* to feel the sting of conscience, that youth is no excuse, that he is lost, that he should seek honor, devote himself endlessly to reading and learning wisdom, that he *ought* to leave fools and foolish pleasures alone and be the master, not the servant, of his fate. But he rejects this sage advice of his better self and derisively snaps his fingers at it with his cynical "et je m'en passeray." It may be objected that such admissions, humorously repulsed though they are, in themselves constitute an act of contrition. Perhaps. But they are accompanied by no reference to his actual crimes, no evidence of regret, no promise of reform. Instead, his wicked self always has the last word with the sardonic refrain that it can do without his better self's good counsel. And just as when Villon asks his friends to have pity on him and get him out of prison, blaming Fortune for his plight (*Poésies diverses*, ix, 5; cf. also P.D. xii), so here he does not blame himself: the fault is in his stars.

Even in the famous *Épitaphe* (P.D. xiv), one of the most realistically imaginative poems of all times, written with the gallows at his elbow, Villon reveals no contriteness. Once more in the clutches of the law and this time surely condemned to death, the poet shows humility and

6. It should be noted that when Villon blames poverty for his difficulties he takes no lofty social stand on the inequalities of men's stations: he would not himself live poor Gontier's life for a single day and considers enjoying one's ease the greatest of joys (T. 1465 ff.). He objects to poverty because it makes men go astray from necessity, because the poor man has less power and fewer rights than the rich, because a famished body keeps one from amorous dalliance. He says the poor need patience and that jokes about them are not in place. Still he exhibits no great sympathy for them. Indeed Cons thought the bequest of *Lais* 233 ff. to the unkempt fellows lying frozen under the stalls who are left an equivocal *grognee* (a blow and an old coin) actually shows Villon's contempt for the men "who lacked the courage and boldness to become criminals like himself" (*MLN*, LVII [1942], 526-527). But it seems possible that as usual Villon was merely ironical. In any case his picture of these poor wretches, lean, wet, bruised, trembling with cold in the short hosen and tattered clothes he bequeaths them is sufficiently poignant in itself to connote some sympathy. Similarly when in T. 1644 ff. he leaves little to the hospitals and poorhouses and recalls the old proverb that small folk shall have small change, one cannot assume that he was oblivious to the sufferings of the indigent. Poverty is not a pleasant subject (T., 265 ff.); for Villon it is an excuse, an occasion for self-pity or sneers at the stingy rich, rather than a matter for protest.

7. *Poésies diverses*, xi, in Foulet's fourth edition for the *CFMA*, 1932. This edition is used throughout my paper. Its numbering of the *Poésies diverses* (here abbreviated P.D.) differs somewhat from that in other editions. P.D. xi, like the *Epistre a ses amis* (P.D. ix), is usually thought to have been written while Villon was in prison at Meung and therefore before his release in Oct. 1461, whereas the *Testament* is generally dated between Oct. 1461 and the following Easter (a period which would have been *l'an soixante et ung* by the old system). On Siciliano's dating, see below, Part III.



fear of punishment, he asks his fellow men for their pity and their prayers, he begs Jesus for absolution, he vividly paints a horrible picture of the hangman's victims. But does he repent? His only excuse is the morally feeble "tous hommes n'ont pas bon sens rassis." This is hardly a *mea culpa*, a recognition of personal guilt. And when Villon escapes the fate he so vividly and poignantly envisaged in his *Épitaphe*, when he writes his exultant *Question au clerc du guichet* (P.D. xvi), there is absolutely no trace of remorse. He says that if he had been related to the butchers and had thus had some claim on the man who judged him, he would never have had to submit to the question in his prison slaughter-house; he insists that his punishment was arbitrary and that he was sentenced through trickery. Nor do we find a conscience-stricken poet in the labored *Louenge a la court* (P.D. xv), written at the same time, in which he extravagantly thanks the court for commuting his sentence. He wants his five senses and all his vile body to sing praises, he also begs for three days of grace so that he may put his affairs in order before going into exile, but though he calls his body "pire qu'ours, ne pourceau qui fait son nyt es fanges," he makes no confession of any sins nor does he give any pledge of reform or reparation.

## II

In only one poem, so far as I know, does Villon play the role of a man who recognizes his own guilt, repents and promises to amend his ways. And this I believe was written with his tongue in his cheek, to make a good impression on some man who held him in bondage. Opinions about the so-called *Ballade de bon conseil* (P.D. 1), which is addressed to "hommes faillis, bersaudez de raison," have varied little: most critics date it early and rightly consider it of little merit. Gaston Paris (*op. cit.*, p. 102), Thuasne in his edition (III, 550), Siciliano (*op. cit.*, pp. 29 n. 1, and 108) and Foulet, by the position he accords it, would all place it early; Paris and Thuasne regard it as mediocre, unworthy of the poet, and think it was written before Villon had gone over entirely to evil company, while he still entertained the sentiments of *un honnête homme*; Siciliano believes it a scholar's *pensum* written when the poet was very young. Jeanroy in his edition (p. 165), without attempting to date the poem, speaks of it as "cette médiocre ballade, qu'on hésiterait à attribuer à Villon si elle n'était signée en acrostiche."

Champion, however, refers to the poem as "cette belle pièce" and places it late, after Villon's return to Paris in 1461 or 1462 (*op. cit.*, II, 235-237; cf. 122, 134). Indeed Champion uses these lines as evidence that Villon during his exile had reflected much, had reformed, and intended henceforth to follow the paths of wisdom and piety.



Now there is nothing to bear out the assumption of Paris, Thuasne and Siciliano that this is an *œuvre de début*, written while the poet was *encore honnête homme*, or that a mediocre poem "calqué sur un texte connu" need be a scholar's *pensum*. On the other hand, there is good reason for putting the poem slightly later than Champion does, though without accepting his appraisal of its literary value.

That Villon associates himself with the *hommes faillis* is obvious from his use of the first person plural: *ne nous venjons, prenons en patience, de bien faisons effort, reprenons cuer, ayons en Dieu confort, de nos mauulx ont noz parens le ressort, ordre nous fault, ne laissons le vray port*. This is not the advice of an innocent youth, but an admission of membership in the group of wicked men he is addressing. As others have observed, the poem connects very closely in theme and phrase with the *Belle leçon aux enfants perdus* and the following *Ballade de bonne doctrine* of the *Testament* (1668 ff.). But a comparison of the *Ballade de bon conseil* with the poems of the *Testament* shows that, despite many similarities, there is one essential difference. Some of the same malefactors are in the poet's mind on both occasions,<sup>8</sup> the concern with death is similar,<sup>9</sup> and there is a like ring of *à quoi bon* in the two series of verbs that begin in P.D. 1, 21 with "que vault piper, flater, rire en trayson" and in T. 1700 with "ryme, raille, cymballe, luttés." But the essential difference is that in the *Testament* Villon assumes a light, ironical tone, whereas in the *Ballade de bon conseil* his words are deadly serious without a trace of his usual humor or his usual wry cynicism.

In the latter poem Villon calls his associates men who are wicked, justly tormented, unnatural, out of their senses, courting a detestable death through cowardice. They are not the fair lads with gluey fingers, his companions in pleasure, who are addressed in the *Testament*, but include poisoners and murderers not hinted at there. He urges these fallen men to recognize their errors, not to seek vengeance, to be patient and virtuous, to take heart, have faith in God, live in peace, end strife and achieve a favorable status in the world. They are not told, as in the *Testament*, that whatever they may do, good or ill, all their gains will go to the inns and girls. Nor are they warned in light, derisory banter against losing their skins on the gallows like Colin de Cayeux (T. 1671-1675) or to keep away from the scorching heat that blackens

8. Cf. P.D. 1, 4, *folz abusez* with T. 1682, *fol et infame*; P.D. 1, 16, *tollir, ravir, piller* with T. 1697, *soies larron, raviss ou pillés*; P.D. 1, 21, *que vault piper, flater, rire en trayson* with T. 1693, *pipeur ou hasardeur de dez*; P.D. 1, 23, *farcer* with T. 1702, 1704, *farce . . . farces*. It should be noted here that the first stanza of the second *Ballade en jargon* parallels in some respects the first stanza of the *Belle leçon*.

9. Cf. P.D. 1, 6, *detestable mort* with T. 1724, *mal mors*; P.D. 1, 28, *nous n'avons jour certain en la sepmaine* with T. 1726-27, *soiez tous recors qu'une fois viendra que mourrez*.

the bodies of the hanged (T. 1722-1723). The lines of the *Ballade de bon conseil* are not laced with twisted laughter, but are heavy, pedantic and highly moral.

In its ponderous air of virtue it also differs from another poem with which it may be profitably compared, the *Epistre a ses amis* (P.D. ix). The *Epistre* calls on Villon's friends to get him out of prison, but these friends are described as *gens d'esperit, ung petit estourdis*, not *hommes faillis*. Like those addressed in T. 1668 ff., they are light-hearted poets and musicians, dancers, girls, lovers, merry makers of song and rhyme, and unlike the wretches of P.D. i (as well as others mentioned in T. 1668 ff.) they are not thieves, gamblers, card sharps and murderers. Since Villon is asking a favor of his friends here, rather than proffering advice, the difference in epithets may not be too significant. However, the bantering tone of the verses in the *Testament*, so entirely absent from P.D. i, obtains throughout P.D. ix. Though Villon is imploring help to get himself released from prison, though he feelingly refers to his sufferings, he can still joke about his fasting on feast days, about his teeth longer than a rake's from a dry-bread-and-water diet *sans* cake, and he can still thumb his nose at the end by remarking to his potential rescuers that even pigs rally around when one of them grunts.

Villon's association of himself with the *hommes faillis* in P.D. i, the echoes in this poem of lines from the *Testament*, the poet's concern with the fate of men who steal and murder, men like his comrades Regnier de Montigny and Colin de Cayeux who were put to death in 1457 and 1460 respectively, "par offenser et prendre autrui demaine," all seem to me to date this poem late. Moreover the series of verbs in the first person plural precludes the likelihood that it is the work of an innocent man. Indeed the whole poem suggests lines written in prison and a profession of guilt.

However, those who consider it mediocre and no better than a school exercise are surely right. The dull, virtuous tone, the uninspired phrases and the citation of apostolic authority<sup>10</sup> recall the mannered poems which Villon wrote when he felt ill at ease in the presence of "the great." The poem he addressed to Marie d'Orléans (P.D. viii),<sup>11</sup> the *Ballade pour Robert d'Estouteville* (T. 1378 ff.), the *Louenge a la court* (P.D. xv) have the same awkward heaviness. I suggest therefore that the moralizing tone and the recognition of his own sinfulness, both so contrary to his usual attitude, were designed to impress some "higher-

10. Villon doubtless had Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans in mind. Chapter xii, 18-19 = P.D. i, 12 and 31-32; possibly chapter i, 29-32 may account for Villon's list of sinners. But the parallels are not close enough to constitute a "*pensum scolaire* calqué sur un texte connu," as Siciliano assumes.

11. On this poem see *MLN*, XLVII (1932), 498 ff.

up," that the references to the *hommes faillis*, so different from his other characterizations of his companions, were not intended for the eyes of his erring friends but for those of some jailor who had Villon in his power and who might be moved to a pardon by a confession of guilt and some symptoms of penitence.

It seems likely indeed that the poem was written in the Châtelet in Paris between November 2 and 7, 1462, after Villon had been imprisoned for some unknown theft and after, now caught, he had been charged with his old crime of participation in the robbery of the Collège de Navarre. The refrain about the evils that result from taking other men's property is exactly suited to this occasion; so are the intimations of a generally wicked life, such as Villon was known by this time to have led; so is the unusual atmosphere of contrition. Moreover, Villon was actually liberated from prison on this occasion after he had promised to make reparation to the Collège de Navarre by repaying 120 crowns in three annual installments.<sup>12</sup> Thus the poem, so unlike his customary insolent and mocking verses, would correspond to the only occasion on which we know that the poet admitted guilt by offering to repair the damage he had done. However, of the true inner penitence of a sinner torn by consciousness of guilt and resolved to reform there is little evidence. This is rather a case of what Cons so well recognized when he said (*État*, p. 12): "on peut croire que Villon a dû parfois faire de ses vers un usage pathétiquement intéressé pour garder ou reprendre sa liberté."

### III

If the notion of a penitent Villon is abandoned, the essential psychological unity of the *Testament* becomes apparent. Most critics, while recognizing the fact that some earlier work may be incorporated in the poem, have usually accepted Villon's dating:<sup>13</sup>

Escript l'ay l'an soixante et ung,  
Que le bon roy me delivra  
De la dure prison de Mehun. (T. 81-83)

These scholars, noting differences of tone in various parts of the *Testament*, ascribe them to the poet's dual nature, to his being a penitent,

12. See Champion, *op. cit.*, II, 237-238, who, however, dates the poem before, not after the imprisonment. Paris (*op. cit.*, 103) and Thuausne (ed., III, 550) think that in the *Testament* Villon was using the theme treated earlier in the *Ballade de bon conseil*, but I hope to have shown that the latter was the later poem. Poor work is not necessarily earlier than good, as these critics would assume: cf. P.D. xv.

13. Villon's ignorance of events that transpired during his absence from Paris have suggested to some that the poet wrote while in hiding outside the town. He seems not to have known that d'Estouteville was no longer provost or that la Machecoue had died. He calls Martin Bellefaye *lieutenant du cas criminel* although this man was replaced by La Dehors on Feb. 16, 1462 n. s., which argues either that the *Testament* was written before that date or that Villon did not know of the change.

however wicked, a sinner yet somehow "grand, quasi pur."<sup>14</sup> If one substitutes for this picture of the penitent sinner that of a man who knew what was right but impenitently did what was wrong, a man who could jest at the pricks of conscience he *ought* to feel but did not feel, a man who regretted punishment rather than crime, then the true unity of spirit in the *Testament* becomes even more obvious.

Siciliano would contend, however, that Villon's date applies to only part of the poem and that the so-called dual nature of the poet does not exist, not at least simultaneously.<sup>15</sup> The differences of tone and discrepancies of other sorts which he detects derive, he thinks, from different periods in the poet's life. The first 800 lines approximately were written later than the rest, according to this scholar. The main, "earlier" part of the *Testament*, from ca. line 800 to the end, he finds light-hearted and gay, a continuation in matter and spirit of the *Lais*, and he assumes it was written by a relatively care-free young man, begun perhaps while he was a prisoner at Meung. The "later" introduction, where Villon pictures himself as sick, old, desperate, abandoned by his own people, Siciliano would date from after 1464, perhaps even as late as 1476.<sup>16</sup>

But surely this is an over-simplification. The hatred of Thibault and the joy at the poet's release from prison have the ring of contemporaneity. And why should the poet be care-free and gay while a prisoner? Moreover there is light-hearted jesting throughout the so-called "serious" introduction. Villon pictures himself there not only as "triste, failly, plus noir que meure" (179 ff.), but also as "foible . . . plus de biens que de santé" (73-74). Even in the midst of his references to poverty and death he can joke: it is better to be poor and alive than rich and dead like Jacques Cœur (285): he will die some day, but he hopes to have enjoyed himself first (419).

14. Cons (*État*, 130 ff., 138 ff.) derives the psychological unity of the poem from the poet's consistent hatred throughout of Thibault d'Aussigny and from the fact that this man, unlike a pitiful Alexander, failed Villon morally. Because Thibault remained so cruel and hard, Cons thinks, Villon fell lower and lower till all honor was dead; the *Ballade de la Grosse Margot* was designed to show that the prelate had killed the poet's honor. Certainly hatred of Thibault pervades much of the poem, but I cannot see the relation between this hatred and the Grosse Margot *ballade*. The *ballade* meshes with its surroundings, and Villon is concerned before and after with similar thoughts and similar women. Nor would I put this poem early and link it with the court of Charles d'Orléans, as Foulet does (*Romania*, LVI [1930], 389 ff.). The poem shows Villon at his most cynically depraved. Not only is it wholly different in tone from the two poems known to have been written at Charles's court, but that nobleman and his friends, from all we know of them, would have been horrified by Villon's naturalism.

15. Siciliano has twice advanced his views: *La Rassegna*, XXXVIII (1930), 1-26; *François Villon*, pp. 106 ff., especially 445 ff.

16. The date 1464 depends on an uncertain dating of the manuscripts; the later date, 1476, on the reference to "le bon feu duc d'Alençon" in T. 383, a man insecurely identified as Jean II who did not die until 1476.

Siciliano finds discrepancies between the "earlier" and "later" parts in Villon's attitude toward love: he pretends to be an "amant martyr" in the "earlier" part (2001, 2015) while in the "later" he says he has to abandon love because his sad heart and famished stomach take him from amorous paths (195 ff.). Yet in line 712, which by hypothesis should belong to the "late" part, Villon says he is called "l'amant remys et regnyé" and Siciliano can only explain this stanza by the assumption that it is an attempt at "soldering." But what of the enumeration of the contradictions that his faithless lady would have him believe (689 ff.)? These do not sound like the jokes of the aged, disheartened, gravely penitent and morally matured sinner painted by Siciliano. Again in 729 ff. when the poet describes himself as nearing his end, spitting collops large as tennis balls, he lightly asks what this may mean and answers with his usual irony that it means Jenny will no longer think of him as a young gallant but as an impotent old nag. One might add that Villon's references to his infirmities and poverty, which supposedly characterize only the "late" introduction, may also be found in the posited "earlier" portion (cf. 1462, 1466, 1894-1896).

In short Siciliano's discrepancies do not seem to me to derive from different periods in the poet's life. The same "duality" that obtains in the *Testament* obtains in the nearly contemporaneous *Debat du cuer et du corps*. It is not the duality of "je ris en pleurs" or of sinner and penitent. Our poet had good religious training and was himself sincerely religious up to a certain point. He knows what is right; he does what is wrong, and without remorse. When exiled or imprisoned he suffers and hates with all a poet's sensitivity. But he never loses his power of joking about his enemies and himself, he never loses his *joie de vivre*. And he never truly detests his sins, repents or recants.

Whether all the *Testament* was written at one time or not—and there is good reason to believe that some of the lyrical pieces like the ballade for Robert d'Estouteville (1378 ff.) and the rondeau for Ythier Marchant (978 ff.) were independently composed—nevertheless Siciliano's division into an introduction written late and a main will written early does not seem valid. It neglects the twisted irony of a man who can envisage with equanimity his evil self triumphing over the good counsels of his own conscience, a man who later could laugh in the very face of death and write:

Je suis François, dont il me poise,  
Né de Paris emprés Pontoise,  
Et de la corde d'une toise  
Sçaura mon col que mon cul poise. (P.D. xiii)

## IV

It seems quite certain to me that Villon never thought of himself as a criminal at all. The murder of Sermoise was not planned. The robbery of the Collège de Navarre—and doubtless other robberies—weighed lightly upon him. Whatever the charge that brought him into the power of Thibault, he resented the punishment as unfair and believed his release by King Louis no more than his due.<sup>17</sup> When he was in prison for some minor theft on November 2, 1462 and was charged in addition with the old robbery of the Collège de Navarre of 1456, he soon gained his freedom. The sentence of death passed upon him at the end of 1462 must have struck him as wholly undeserved: it was imposed as a consequence of an insignificant broil in which a man was hurt, but in which Villon seems to have played a subordinate role. Doubtless the Châtelet was influenced on this occasion by his past record, his previous arrests and his association with notorious criminals, some of whom had been hanged, his “mauvaise vie,” as the slightly later decree of banishment phrased it: so harsh a sentence for a relatively unimportant offense implies that Villon must have been regarded as an incorrigible. And yet again he was reprieved.

It seems obvious that in Villon's own mind the severity of his punishments always outweighed any sense of guilt. He excused himself on the score of need, of weakness, of fate, of the actions of his enemies. But he never conceded to himself that he deserved exile and imprisonment, least of all a sentence of death by hanging. Perhaps he was right, perhaps his weak character might have been fortified by less restraint and more understanding. Yet he seems always to have got off lightly enough, and repetition of misdeeds in the face of considerable clemency does suggest incorrigibility. Villon was probably more discerning when he wrote, “je congnois tout, fors que moy mesmes” (P.D. III). At any rate, incorrigible and impenitent as he probably was, it has well been said that “les fautes de Villon nous ont fait perdre un honnête homme dans le passé et nous ont donné un grand poète pour toujours.”<sup>18</sup>

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

17. Siciliano, *François Villon*, p. 80, recognizes the fact that Villon's hatred of Thibault and his willingness to speak of his imprisonment are accompanied by no protestations of penitence or submission. He concludes from this that either Villon's fault was light or his punishment over-severe. He does not realize that impenitence normally characterized Villon's attitude toward his own crimes and punishment.

18. See Paris, *op. cit.*, p. 81.



## PARODY IN THE FRENCH THEATER: A NOTE ON ITS VOGUE

---

THE ABUNDANCE and apparently overwhelming popularity of dramatic parodies in France during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries<sup>1</sup> was perhaps one inevitable product of an engaging national genius for light-hearted and essentially inoffensive irreverence.

Of course, the parody did not even approach the rank of a major genre. The attitude of the critics toward it ranged from indignation through contemptuous silence to good-humored indulgence. Not amused, Théophile Gautier<sup>2</sup> gave voice to his exasperation on numerous occasions. "Cette parodie," he said once, "nous a beaucoup ennuyé et déplu comme une profanation." Another time he averred, "Nous n'aimons pas à voir traiter irrévérencieusement quelque mythologie que ce soit." Again, "Nous avouons humblement n'avoir jamais rien compris aux parodies. En effet, que peut-il y avoir de plaisant . . . ? Outre que les parodies frappent souvent à faux, elles ont l'inconvénient de ridiculiser même les plus belles choses. . . . Rien n'aura donc manqué au succès [*sic!*] des *Burgraves*, . . . ni l'opposition systématique qui s'attaque à toutes les grandes idées." Finally, in a supreme fit of pique, "les oies ont, en effet, plus dévoré d'hommes de génie que les vautours." In view of the modest claims of most parodies, these reprimands seem disproportionately—perhaps humorlessly—harsh. They are certainly not representative.

Other critics were inclined toward sweet and reasonable tolerance. For example, Noël and Stoullig:<sup>3</sup> "Nous constatons que la grande critique, assez indulgente en général pour la *Georgette* de M. Sardou, s'est montrée sévère—sévère, mais injuste—pour la parodie qu'on nous a donnée. . . . Pour nous, la plaisanterie nous a paru de bonne guerre et nous devons dire que la *Fille à Georgette* a franchement diverti le public, comme une joyeuse farce qu'elle est. Que peut-on demander de plus à une parodie? . . . On a ri de l'idée, qui n'est en somme pas plus mauvaise qu'une autre, et on a fait un succès. . . . Encore une fois, tout cela est très gai, et on a beaucoup ri; c'est assurément tout ce que voulaient les auteurs de la *Fille à Georgette*."

1. Cf. V. B. Grannis, *Dramatic Parody in Eighteenth Century France*, Institute of French Studies, New York, 1931; and the present writer's *Catalogue of Nineteenth Century French Theatrical Parodies*, King's Crown Press, New York, 1941, in which over twelve hundred parodies are listed for the period between 1789 and 1914.

2. *Histoire de l'art dramatique en France depuis vingt-cinq ans*, II, 50-51, 153; III, 33-34; VI, 101.

3. *Les Annales du théâtre et de la musique*, XII, 235 ff.



The persistency of the genre indicates that the public did not share Gautier's distaste for irreverent treatment of well-known subjects. Indeed, some of the outstanding successes in this field were those which parodied most shamelessly that mythology which he held so sacred: *La Belle Hélène*, *Orphée aux enfers*, and *Les Petites Danaïdes, ou Quatre-vingt-dix-neuf victimes*. It may be that the great frequency with which Victor Hugo's plays, as well as those of other Romantic dramatists, were selected for ridicule had something to do with Gautier's impatience. *Harnali, ou la Contrainte par cor*,<sup>4</sup> was most enthusiastically acclaimed, while a host of others amused the public in varying degrees.

Yet information about parodies was rare in the press of the period. The space devoted to dramatic criticism in some journals was, more or less obviously, determined by how much and how long the producers paid. An outrageously laudatory review would appear intact and unchanged day after day, then disappear abruptly when advertising of the play ceased, only to reappear along with the advertisements some time later. The budget of the theatres which presented parody evidently did not provide for such publicity.

So instead of being the recipient of publicity, the parody itself served as excellent publicity for the original. For a parody, be it ever so wicked in tone or intention, is willy-nilly a tribute to the popularity of the original—or at least of its author—in substantially the same sense that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Unrecognizable plays are not profitable subjects for the parodist.

The point of view that the very existence of a parody constitutes homage paid to the popularity of the original is frequently expressed by the parody itself:

#### FOLLEVILLE

*Et cette comédie,  
Avec tant de raison, admirée, applaudie,  
Va donc subir l'affront d'un vers imitateur?*

#### DERMON

*Non: de la parodie elle obtiendra l'honneur:  
Ne l'obtient pas qui veut; la critique abandonne  
L'ouvrage qui n'est ni vu ni loué de personne.  
(L'Ecole des bêtequillards,<sup>5</sup> prologue.)*

4. Parodie en 5 tableaux et en vers, par Auguste de Lauzanne; Théâtre du Vaudeville, 23 mars 1830. Paris, 1830.

5. Imitation burlesque de "l'Ecole des vieillards" [a comedy by Casimir Delavigne] en 1 acte et en vers, par [Théophile-Marion] Dumersan et Henri Dupin; Théâtre des Variétés, 6 janvier 1824. Paris, 1824.

Such flattery is eloquent testimony to the unpretentious character of most parodies. They fully recognize and honor the merit of the original while belittling their own:

*Il faut que les auteurs aient eu de l'estomac  
Pour parodier Cyrano de Bergerac.  
Cette œuvre magnifique, aux vers d'Hugo pareille,  
Dont le rythme joyeux vous chatouille l'oreille  
Et qu'on doit au cerveau d'un poète épatant. . . .  
De cette parodie excusez la faiblesse.  
Les auteurs ont fait queue à la Port' Saint-Martin,  
Impossible d'avoir le moindre strapontin.  
(Cyraneux de Blairgerac,<sup>6</sup> prologue.)*

Here is further testimony to this fundamental modesty:

*Je suis la Parodie . . . une aimable rieuse!  
Je me moque de tout! . . . Fort peu prétentieuse,  
Je n'ai pour objectif que de chasser l'ennui,  
En caricaturant les chefs-d'œuvre d'autrui!  
Or, le dernier chef-d'œuvre est à coup sûr, l'ouvrage  
Qu'a donné Dumas fils! Il fait très grand tapage  
Et Paris tout entier s'occupe en ce moment  
Du sujet de la pièce et de son dénoûment!  
Donc, si vous voulez bien me permettre de rire  
Aux dépens de l'auteur que tout le monde admire. . . .  
(La Petite Francillon,<sup>7</sup> prologue.)*

More of the same:

*La parodie est toujours téméraire,  
Et, cependant, je réclame en tremblant,  
Pardonnez-moi, dans cette œuvre légère,  
Si j'imitai l'artiste de talent!  
Faites deux parts en cette circonstance,  
Et nos destins seront encore fort beaux:  
Réservez-nous, messieurs, votre indulgence,  
Ristori<sup>8</sup> seule a droit à vos bravos.  
(Bébé-Actrice,<sup>9</sup> fin.)*

The parodied author and his actors often get handsome compliments from the parodists:

6. Parodie du chef-d'œuvre de M. Edmond Rostand en 1 acte, par [Ernest] Gerny et [Paul] Briollet; Eldorado, 12 février 1898. Paris, 1898.

7. Petite parodie en 1 petit prologue, 3 petits actes et 2 petits entr'actes, par [Hector] Monréal, [Henri] Blondeau et [Alphonse] Lemonnier; Théâtre des Variétés, 13 février 1887. Paris, 1887.

8. Mme Ristori was the actress who played the leading role in the original.

9. Parodie-vaudeville en 1 acte [of Ernest Legouvé's *Béatrix*, performed at the Odéon], par [Paul] Siraudin et [Adolphe] Choler; Théâtre du Palais-Royal, 17 mai 1861. Paris, 1861..

## DANVILLE

... et nous irons voir ce soir l'Ecole des Gana . . . non,  
L'Ecole des Vieillards!

## LE DUC

Et nous applaudirons et l'auteur et l'acteur.  
Si l'un nous rend et Brizard<sup>10</sup> et Lekain,<sup>10</sup>  
L'autre déjà suit Racine et Molière,  
Ils ont chaussé cothurne et brodequin  
Pour illustrer doublement leur carrière.  
Quand leurs succès de toutes parts  
Sont la gloire de notre scène;  
Le dieu du goût à nos regards  
Les place au temple des beaux-arts  
Entre Thalie et Melpomène.

(L'Ecole des ganaches,<sup>11</sup> sc. 21.)

This last passage and the next two may seem even a bit fulsome:

Messieurs, quand du parnasse un poète en faveur  
Atteint, dès son début la sublime hauteur;  
Quand aux brillants accords dont sa lyre résonne,  
Melpomène, en ce jour, décerne la couronne,  
Vous ne penserez pas que nos auteurs jaloux,  
Veulent ternir l'éclat d'un triomphe aussi doux.  
Non, Messieurs, dans des vers dictés par la folie,  
Leur muse en badinant rend hommage au génie.

(Jocrisse-paria,<sup>12</sup> fin.)

Nos vers sont un peu sans façon,  
Mais cette critique indiscreète  
N'enlève pas un seul fleuron  
A la couronne du poète.  
Faites en juges bienveillants  
La part de notre parodie.  
On travestit les grands talents  
Mais la France, dans tous les temps,  
Sait faire la part du génie.

(Les Buses graves.<sup>13</sup>)

10. Both celebrated actors: Jean-Baptiste Britard dit Brizard (1721-1791) and Henri-Louis Cain, dit Lekain (1728-1778).

11. Parodie de "l'Ecole des vieillards" en 1 acte et en vers, et en vaudevilles, par Francis [baron d'Allarde], [Armand] Dartois et Gabriel [pseudonym of Jules-Joseph-Gabriel de Lurieu]; Théâtre du Vaudeville, 8 janvier 1824. Paris, 1824.

12. Tragédie burlesque en 1 acte et en vers [of Casimir Delavigne's *Le Paria*], par [Villain de] Saint-Hilaire et Edmond [Crosnier]; Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, 26 décembre 1821. Paris, 1822.

13. Parodie des "Burgraves" en 3 actes et en vers, par [Charles-Désiré] Dupeuty et Langlé [pseudonym of Joseph-Adolphe-Ferdinand Langlois]; Théâtre des Variétés, 22 mars 1843. Paris, 1843.

This one is something less than a full-bodied encomium:

*D'un grand poète les écarts  
Sur lui font pleuvoir maints brocards,  
C'est ce qui nous désole;  
Mais de ses odes la beauté  
Le mène à l'immortalité,  
C'est ce qui nous console.*

(Ruy Brac.<sup>14</sup>)

The cheerful lack of pretense reflected in the above quotations is, in the main, characteristic of nineteenth-century parodies. A few, however, were used seriously as a weapon against an author, his ideas, the school of literature he represented, or occasionally even his politics. For example, the parodies of Emile Augier's *Le Fils de Giboyer* contained veritable tirades against his liberal and anticlerical beliefs, and their banter had real sting in it.

Nevertheless, when due allowance has been made for these exceptional cases, where the parodist was principally interested in attacking, and was using the parody only as a means to that end, the vast majority of parodies did not take themselves at all seriously. Their primary aim was to amuse the theater-going public at a profit. If this entailed a certain amount of chaffing of masters and jeering at masterpieces, no harm was considered to have been done, and everybody—public, authors (both parodying and parodied), publishers, and theatrical people—was happy. In the relatively few cases when the public was not pleased, newspaper and periodical reports testify that it hardly hesitated to make its displeasure known at first (or subsequent, if any) performances.

In such events it goes without saying that the parodists were none too pleased either, though they usually succeeded in saving at least their good name from the wreckage. Newspapers announcing a forthcoming parody generally gave only its title. From the files of manuscripts offered for the censors' approval,<sup>15</sup> the parodists' names are missing in the great majority of instances. Indeed, this was no more than ordinary precaution. It is clear from the reviews of dramatic critics that every now and then, after witnessing the reception a first night audience gave to a parody, its author might have every reason to doubt the wisdom of making himself known. Some doubly prudent parodists refrained from acknowledging their handiwork even in response to the audiences' cries of "author," frequently giving some pseudonym. A number of such pseudonyms have remained mysteries, while a good many were subsequently solved.

14. Tourte en 5 boulettes, avec assaisonnement de gros sel, de vers et de couplets, par Maxime de Redon; Théâtre Comte, 28 novembre 1838. Paris, 1838.

15. Archives Nationales, Paris, série F<sup>19</sup>.

There are some instances in which the parodied authors were also vexed. De Bersaucourt shows<sup>16</sup> by quoting not only Mme Hugo but Hugo himself (in a letter dated January 5, 1830 to the Comte de Montbel, Minister of the Interior) that the latter was decidedly ill-disposed toward parodists.<sup>17</sup> This is scarcely surprising if we consider Hugo's temperament—he did not enjoy a joke at his expense—and the character of the parodies. Some were venomous, it is true. And their object of attack—for here the parody was simply one form of attack—was not Hugo *per se*, but rather the Romantic drama he was supposed to be inaugurating.<sup>18</sup> Here one has only to recall the famous première of *Hernani* to be reminded of the passions called forth.

The question of plagiarism is also to be considered. Every so often the press would clamor<sup>19</sup> that the parodists were abusing their privilege and should be curbed. The original play, so the charge went, was being disguised by a few minor changes and called a parody. We suspect that these charges were usually inspired by some exceptionally bad sport of a playwright, actor or producer, who did not fancy his treatment at the hands of a particular parodist. What merit there is in the charges resides in the fact that some imitations were assuredly inept, contained little or no criticism, and depended for their effectiveness solely upon the reduction of the characters in social rank. So that in such cases the parody would consist of a scene for scene, speech for speech, slavish following of the original.

It will be freely admitted by anyone who has read any considerable number of these parodies that they can be wretched stuff indeed, but for that very reason he will find the accusation of attempted plagiarism unconvincing, since they could not fail to be recognized for what they were by the least discerning spectator.

When exceptions have been accounted for, though, it remains true that by and large all involved in a parody venture were pleased. Nay

16. Albert de Bersaucourt, *Les Pamphlets contre Victor Hugo*, Paris, 1912, pp. 297 ff.

17. For a detailed treatment of parodies of Hugo's plays, cf. A. Blanchard, *Le Théâtre de Victor Hugo et la Parodie*, Amiens, 1903; De Bersaucourt, *op. cit.*; Emile Morlot, "La Parodie du théâtre de Victor Hugo," *Revue d'art dramatique*, iv (1886), 229 ff.

18. Incidentally, De Bersaucourt places what seems to the writer too much emphasis (*op. cit.*, p. 299) upon the rapidity with which parodies of Victor Hugo's plays were produced. There are other and sounder arguments to prove the bitterness of his critics and the probable connivance of the censors. For a comparative study of dates reveals many examples of parodies emerging a mere matter of a few days after the first performance of the original, to say nothing of the twenty-day interval which so impresses De Bersaucourt. This rapidity of production is very likely due to more natural causes: a burning desire on the part of the parodist to "cash in" on the popularity of a "hit" and a similar burning desire on the part of the author and others connected with the original play to create the impression without delay that their play is such a great hit that it has already earned the honor of being parodied. While these reasons may not have operated in Hugo's case, the fact that they did operate in so many other cases should make this rapidity less valid as an argument in his case.

19. A good example is the issue of *La Lanterne* of January 13, 1904.

more, we have good reason to believe that at least some authors and publishers were anxious to have their works parodied because of the excellent publicity the procedure offered them. We know of some authors (and suspect many more) who produced parodies of their own plays!<sup>20</sup> The same publisher sometimes released both play and parody.

According to Lecomte,<sup>21</sup> it was the director of the Porte-Saint-Martin Theatre, where Dumas's *Richard Darlington* was appearing, who had a parody of it made to order and performed at the Odéon.<sup>22</sup> Dumas himself blandly tells of collaborating on a parody of one of his own plays:

*Henri III*, destiné d'avance à un grand succès ou tout au moins à un grand bruit, devait avoir sa parodie; pour faciliter l'exécution de cette œuvre importante, j'avais d'avance communiqué mon manuscrit à de Leuven et à Rousseau; puis, sur leur demande, j'avais collaboré de mon mieux à la pièce qui reçut le titre du *Roi Dagobert et sa Cour*.

Mais ce titre parut à la censure irrévérencieux à l'égard du descendant de Dagobert.

Par le descendant de Dagobert, cette honorable compagnie qui porte pour armes les ciseaux de sable sur champ d'argent entendait Sa Majesté Charles X. Elle confondait descendant avec successeur; mais, on le sait, messieurs du comité d'examen n'y regardent pas de si près.

Nous changeâmes le titre et nous prîmes celui de la *Cour du roi Pétaud*,<sup>23</sup> titre auquel la censure ne trouva aucun inconvénient.

Comme si personne ne descendait du roi Pétaud!

Ce fut donc sous ce titre que fut jouée, au Vaudeville, la parodie de *Henri III et sa Cour*.

(Dumas, *Mes Mémoires*, vi, 6-7.)

In a preface the author of *La Princesse Delhi-lâ*<sup>24</sup> declares:

Le mardi, 8 septembre, à trois heures du soir, une jeune et charmante personne, fille d'un des plus anciens libraires de Bruxelles, nous engageait à faire une parodie de *Dalila* pour pousser à la vente de cette pièce qui n'allait pas.

After this, one suspects that the author of *Dalila* must have found it a wee bit awkward to register indignation.

SEYMOUR TRAVERS

### *College of the City of New York*

20. Cf. my *Catalogue*, Numbers 92, 101, 102, 243, 245, 500, 507, 511, 573, 592, 712, 1036, 1038—to say nothing of those who succeeded in retaining their anonymity.

21. L.-Henry Lecomte, *Les Parodies théâtrales en France*, MS. at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris, p. 187.

22. *Piffard drôle de ton*, parodie en trois actes et un prologue, par Dumersan, Vilain de Saint-Hilaire et Brunswick [pseudonym of Léon Lévy, dit Lhérie]; Odéon, 31 décembre 1831. Not published.

23. *Vaudeville à tableaux* [in one act], par Langlé, A. de Leuven [pseudonym of Count Adolphe de Ribbing] et Alexandre [Dumas]; Théâtre du Vaudeville, 28 février 1829. Not published.

24. *Petite parodie en 5 actes et en vers burlesques, de Dalila* [by Octave Feuillet], grand drame en 3 actes et en prose, par Francisque Tapon-Fogas. Bruxelles, 1857.

## ITALIAN GUGLIA, GIORNO AND THE NEO-GRAMMARIANS

IN TWO RECENT ARTICLES on Italian (*a*)*guglia* "pinnacle, obelisk"<sup>1</sup> and *giorno* "day,"<sup>2</sup> G. Bonfante discusses the etymology of these words and, in that connection, attacks the "neo-grammarian" school of linguistics.

With the etymologies Bonfante proposes, there can be no quarrel. The suggestion of deriving (*a*)*guglia* from Lat. *acūcula* through Old French *aguille* [agyʎə], and explaining the Ital. [ʎ] in this word by the hypothesis of borrowing from O. Fr. (in which Lat. [kʰ] > [ʎ]) is novel, unexceptionable from the phonetic, semantic and cultural points of view, and a valid substitute for earlier etymologies (\**agūlia*, *acūlea*). That *giorno* "day" is from *diurnu-*, not directly but through O. Fr., is a valid but not a new suggestion, made most recently by Ringenson.<sup>3</sup>

But with Bonfante's numerous *obiter dicta* and quotations from Bàrtoli attacking the neo-grammarians, there is serious quarrel. The major point at issue is the question of "phonetic law," that is, the neo-grammarians' basic assumption concerning historical linguistics: that, in a given language, *phonemes change*, and change *regularly*. This is an *assumption*, not necessarily a fact of direct observation; but, like all other scientific assumptions, it is made as a guiding principle to enable observers to classify facts and make predictions. The "neo-linguists" (Croce and his followers, e.g. Bàrtoli and Bertoni) and other opponents of the neo-grammarians deny the validity of this assumption. They claim that the principle of regular phonetic change is disproven by facts, and wish to substitute other principles of analysis, e.g. "norms" derived from geographical considerations. Bonfante cites his etymologies as proof of the superiority of the method of the neo-linguists over that of the neo-grammarians; in fact, however, his procedure is based squarely on the neo-grammarian assumption. In order to consider (*a*)*guglia* as derived from *acūcula* through Old French, it is necessary to make: 1) the assumption that the Latin phonemes [kʰ] changed regularly to Ital. [kʎ]<sup>4</sup> and to Old French [ʎ]; and 2) the corollary assumption that, for a form not showing the normal development, some special explanation must be sought, in this case regional borrow-

1. "Neogrammarians and neo-linguists: Italian *guglia*," *RR*, xxxvi (1945), 240-243.

2. "Neogrammarians and neo-linguists: Ital. *giorno*," *PMLA*, lix (1944), 877-881.

3. K. Ringenson, "*Dies et diurnum*. Étude de lexicographie et de stylistique," *Studia Neophilologica*, x (1936), 3-53.

4. As Bonfante himself does explicitly by pointing out that the normal Italian development of *acucula* is *agucchia*!



ing (French origin). To explain Ital. *giorno* as from *diurnu-* through Old French, similar assumptions must be made concerning the Italian and French developments of Latin [dj] and [ũ]. What Bonfante is really demonstrating is, not that the neo-grammarian assumption of regular phonemic change is invalid, but that it *must* be made (as he rightly does, though for the most part implicitly) in order to discover and account for anomalous developments. It is then highly inconsistent to try, as do Bonfante and numerous other opponents of the neo-grammarians,<sup>5</sup> to invalidate one's own basic procedure.

Nor do Bonfante's theoretical diatribes against the neo-grammarians have any foundation. That the earlier neo-grammarians (Leskien, Brugmann, Meyer-Lübke) did not pay *sufficient* attention to disturbing factors other than analogical change (and, in Romance, learned borrowings) is well known to everyone, is in fact *pacifico*;<sup>6</sup> that they paid *no* attention to factors of regional or cultural influence is simply untrue.<sup>7</sup> The modern neo-grammarians (Bloomfield, Sapir, Kurath, etc.) are fully cognizant of regional and cultural factors, but recognize that our assumptions concerning these factors are not central, but corollary to the basic assumption of phonemic change,<sup>8</sup> which is the only assumption that enables us to bring order out of the welter of confused and conflicting data with which we are confronted. Of course any scholar may go wrong on a specific point, and not ascribe the proper weight to one or another factor; but this has nothing to do with fundamental procedure. Actually, every competent linguist today makes the neo-grammarian assumption and follows it in practice; the only difference in practice between the two schools is that the neo-grammarians explicitly formulate their assumptions and know clearly what they are

5. E.g. G. G. Kloeke in his *De Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagsche Nederlandsche dialecten* ('s Gravenhage, 1927; reviewed by L. Bloomfield in *Language*, iv [1938], 284-288); E. Hermann in his *Laugesetz und Analogie* (Berlin, 1931); and the Italian followers of Croce, e.g. G. Bertoni and M. G. Bàrtoli in their *Breviario di Neolinguistica* (Modena, 1925); G. Bertoni, in his *Programma di filologia romanza come scienza idealistica* (Geneva, 1923; *BAR* i, 2); M. G. Bàrtoli, in his *Introduzione alla Neolinguistica* (Geneva, 1925; *BAR*, ii, 2); and in numerous polemic articles by them and their satellites.

6. The leading modern neo-grammarian, L. Bloomfield, has in his book *Language* (ch. xviii) a full and clear discussion of the difficulties confronting the older scholars who developed and used the comparative method, because of their relative neglect of these factors. Cf. also H. Pedersen's exhaustive historical discussion in his *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 248-310.

7. As can be seen by any one who takes the trouble to read, say, Meyer-Lübke's *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* or *Italienische Grammatik*, and as has been pointed out specifically in connection with the debate between neo-grammarians and their opponents, by P. G. Goidànich, *Italia Dialettale*, vii (1931), 146-208.

8. Cf. the discussion of dialect geography and phonetic change in Bloomfield's *Language*, ch. xix, xx; also the discussion of "phonetic law" in Sapir's *Language*, ch. viii. Kurath, the leading American linguistic geographer, has not made any discussion of the matter in print, but has supported the neo-grammarian assumption in lectures and private conversation.

doing and why, whereas their opponents do not. To attempt to revive the attacks of Croce and his followers on the neo-grammarians is simply to show oneself forty years behind the times.

There is nothing original or new in my comments in the last two paragraphs, or in my discussion of Bonfante's etymologies. Then why take the time and trouble to make them, and ask for paper and ink to print them? For two reasons: 1) although such comments have been made before, repeatedly, clearly, and with more or less patience,<sup>9</sup> their import has not "sunk in"; 2) if they are not repeated again, there is danger that the non-specialist public, not knowing the point at issue, may accept the statements of the "neo-linguists" at their face value. Linguistics is a well-established science, with a hundred and fifty years' record of accomplishment, in classification and prediction;<sup>10</sup> but it has not received the public understanding and esteem it merits because its techniques and conclusions go counter to the folklore and the dogmas of our culture concerning language. Due to its recent successes in practical language teaching, linguistics is at present under violently embittered attack, especially by some whose position is endangered by the spread of accurate knowledge and a scientific approach to language. It is all the more important that the true nature, procedures and results of linguistics should be known to the general public. But the "neo-linguists" and "idealists," not understanding the principles on which they themselves work and yielding to the demands of *Vulgärpsychologie*, misinterpret both their own work and that of the neo-grammarians, tend to bring misunderstanding and discredit on linguistics, and play into the hands of its enemies. Workers in linguistics should not endanger their own future and that of their science by trying to saw off the limb on which they are sitting.

ROBERT A. HALL, JR.

Cornell University

9. Cf. especially the series of reviews by L. Bloomfield in the journal *Language*: of Kloeke's work (cf. *supra*, n. 5), iv (1928), 284-288; of J. Ries, *Was ist ein Satz?*, vii (1931), 204-209; of E. Hermann, *Lautesatz und Analogie*, viii (1932), 230-233; and of W. Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, x (1934), 32-40. A recent article by Bloomfield, "Secondary and Tertiary Responses to Language," *Language*, xx (1944), 45-55, a discussion of popular and learned misconceptions on the subject of language, exemplifies the ultimate reaction of the scientist when badgered beyond the limits of patience by misinterpretation and superstition.

10. It should be pointed out here that *prediction* can of course be made with reference to past as well as to future events. Thus, on the basis of phonetic correspondences established with the help of the neo-grammarians assumption, scholars have been able to set up hypothetical forms for Proto-Romance or for Greek dialects, which were later attested in newly discovered records. Prediction is the acid test of a scientific procedure; and it is in this respect that Bårtoli's "neolinguistica" (like all the other substitute principles offered by the neo-grammarians' opponents) fails badly. No one could predict anything on the basis of the confused and often mutually contradictory "norms" that Bårtoli sets up. Cf. in this connection the penetrating (though somewhat flippant) remarks of W. M. Austin on Bårtoli's and Bonfante's "norms," in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXV (1944), 63-64.

## REPLY

IT IS OF COURSE IMPOSSIBLE to summarize here all the theoretical remarks made by generations of linguists, starting from Ascoli, H. Schuchardt, Gaston Paris, Gilliéron down to Campus, Bàrtoli, Bertoni, Terracini, Sommerfelt, Trubetzkoy, Jakobson, Van Ginneken, Vossler, Spitzer, Ringenson, Iordan, Amado Alonso, Menéndez Pidal, Castro and many others. As a matter of fact, the neo-grammarians theories have hardly any defenders today except Hall, Bloomfield and Kurath ("in private conversations"); and if I took the trouble to devote a few words to the question, it was merely because (as often happens) doctrines which are abandoned *in theory* by everybody still continue to do a great deal of damage, because they are still applied *in practice* by scholars who learned to do so in their younger years and who have not changed their methods.

In the two cases that I examined (Italian *giorno* and *guglia*), Mr. Hall admits that the etymology I defend is correct. But in both cases, I tried to show (as Gilliéron, Bàrtoli and others have shown in many other instances) that the wrong explanation was given by the neo-grammarians *precisely because they were neo-grammarians* and because they based their entire conception of language and their whole method of investigation upon the dogma of the *phonetic law*. In the case of *giorno*, they reasoned thus: initial Lat. *dy-* (= *di-*) gives in Italian *dž-* (written *gi-*): cf. *deōrsum* > *giuso*; *ū* (both stressed and unstressed) gives *q* (cf. *mūsca* > *mōsca*, *bōnūm* > *buqno*); *-rn-* remains (*carne* > *carne*); therefore, *giorno* is the regular result of *diurnūm*; therefore *giorno* goes back to *diurnūm*, and the case is solved. But it is *not* so (and Hall admits this). It is what Gilliéron calls a case of "phonetic mirage" (*mirage phonétique*).<sup>1</sup> It is based on the false assumption that "in a given language, phonemes change, and change regularly." There is no such thing as "a given language," nor such thing as a *regular* change (as opposed to the *irregular* change). There is an innumerable variety of forms, phonemes, isoglosses, dialects and so on, and (in the end) every word has its own history, as Bàrtoli rightly states. There are no two words which are found to be under exactly the same conditions, just as there are no two men who are exactly alike; and there is nothing so dangerous as to apply to man, and to his creations (one of which,

1. Therefore, as in this case, a tremendous amount of forms which are apparently "regular" are smuggled over under the cover of the phonetic law and flood our manuals, dictionaries, grammars, etc.

and certainly not the least, is language), absolute laws drawn from the physical sciences, moreover at the very moment when even the physical sciences are abandoning this concept.

A glimpse at any linguistic Atlas (or *e.g.* at the maps, drawn from the *Atlas linguistique de la France*, in Jaberg's *Sprachgeographie*) will show even to the layman that not only do the different phonetic changes which are supposed to define a language not coincide (such as *e.g.*, the loss of preconsonantic *-s-*, the passage *u > ü*, *-a > -e* etc.), all of them defining the "French language"); but that even for two words, no matter how similar, the isogloss is never the same; and that the extension of the passage *ca > cha* is widely different for *chandelle*, *chanter*, *champ*, *chambre*, although in all these words (carefully picked up for this purpose by Jaberg) that *ca-* is followed by a nasal, and the phonetic conditions are therefore exactly the same. If we open the linguistic Atlas of Italy, and look at the two maps 1041 *toro* (from Latin *taurum*) and 406 *oro* (from Latin *aurum*), we will notice an enormous difference in the treatment of the diphthong *au*: while in the case of *taurum* Latin *au* is preserved in the whole of Rhaetia, Sardinia, Sicily and (with very few exceptions) in Southern Italy, in the case of *aurum* it has been replaced everywhere, except in the mountains of Rhaetia, by the literary (that is, Tuscan) phoneme *o* (open *o*). The reason (as in many other cases) is easy to find: since "bulls" are found in the country and are almost unknown in the city, the word for "bull" would present a maximum of fidelity to the older form; for the word "gold" the case is just the opposite: "gold" is possessed by rich people, living for the most part in cities or towns, and (at least in our own time) objects of gold are made almost exclusively in urban centers. Now, which is the *regular* treatment of *au*? That of *taurum* or that of *aurum*? Why should one of these words be more *regular*, more *paradigmatic* than the other one? The whole question of *regular* and *irregular* is absurd in theory and mischievous in practice.

The usual way (in reality, the only *possible* way) of distinguishing between regular and irregular forms is that of the majority: if out of 100 words, 51 show in Italy, or in some Italian dialect, the treatment *o* for *au*, or *-sci-* for *-x-*, or *-gli-* (*-l'*) for *-kl-* (Latin *-cl-*), the neo-grammarians will say that this is the regular treatment; the other 49 words, showing a different treatment (let us say *au* for *au*, or *-ss-* for *-x-*, or *-cchi-* [*-kky-*] for *-cl-*) will be condemned as irregular, and every effort will be made to get rid of them, the sooner the better: they will be branded as borrowings or loan-words, whatever that means (for the neo-linguists it means nothing at all); or the etymology will be denied, even if obvious (as with *acūclam > guglia!*); or a fantastic,

starred form will be constructed (\**coxea*, \**laxiäre*, \**pulsiäre*, \**capsea*, \**aculea*, etc.); or, in *extremis*, an exception will be admitted (whatever that means). All these conceptions (supposing they ever deserved this name) are denied by the neo-linguists: there is no difference between *regular* and *irregular* forms or phonemes, for everything that exists in language is *regular*, since it exists (it is at the same time *irregular*, since it is a *unicum*); there is no such thing as a distinction between *borrowings* and *native* or *indigenous* words, since every word we learn from the day we are born we imitate (or *borrow*) from somebody else (our mother, our father, our friend, our schoolmaster, etc.) and introduce it into our own, personal speech; nor is there such a thing as an *exception*, since every word, and every sound, just as every man, or creation of man, is an *exception*, because it is unique, not like any other one.

The whole absurdity of the neo-grammarian conception of the *regular phonetic change* (or *phonetic law*) emerges clearly from this simple consideration: since what is regular is determined (and can only be determined) by the majority of the cases (51 against 49, we postulated), a small shift in a couple of words (e.g., a slightly stronger influence of the literary language, introducing *š* or *o* instead of *-ss-* [for Latin *x*] or *au* [from Latin *au*] in a Southern Italian dialect) will reverse the whole situation; what was *regular* before, will become *irregular*, and vice versa;<sup>2</sup> all the former *exceptions* or *borrowings* will

2. It is by no means rare or strange—nay, on the contrary, quite common—that a “foreign” phoneme, or articulation of a sound or group, creeps from a “language” into another “language” and invades it to such an extent, that the old “native,” “indigenous” forms remain reduced to a small minority: then the new, foreign phoneme or articulation becomes the *regular* one; the old (the “native,” the “indigenous”) becomes *irregular*, represented sometimes by two or three dying words. What happened e.g. when the articulations *it* (for *et*) or *ēe*, *ēi* (for *ke*, *ki*) invaded Spain, coming from Gaul? or when *ū* (for *u*) invaded Rhetoromance? The ancient, venerable relics of the older phase are then branded by the neo-grammarians as “exceptions,” “irregular forms,” “loan-words,” etc.

Or, conceding for the sake of argument a point to the “neo-grammarians,” and limiting our case to *one language*: how can we conceive that Latin *et* became *it* in peninsular Italian? Overnight? All of a sudden in every village and town of the peninsula? Or did not rather the innovation *it* for *et* start from some urban center (probably Rome) and spread progressively from there to all the parts of the country? If the latter hypothesis is true (and I think common sense shows that it is), then the words with *it* (say *otto* for *octo*) were at first the *foreign* forms, the *exceptions*, the *loan-words* outside of Rome (say in Perugia, Brindisi, etc.) until in lapse of time, receiving reinforcements, they won the majority and became the beautiful, legitimate *regular* forms which they are today. The whole conception of the phonetic law is simply unhistorical and contrary to all our daily linguistic experience.

In Spanish, on the other hand, we find more frequently *al*+consonant “preserved” than transformed to *u*: *alto*, *altro* (Berceo), *alba*, *caldo*, *falso*, *alza*, *alzar*, *calcaño*, *calca*, *alga*, *alba*, *salvia*, *palma*, etc., etc., against *otro*, *otero*, *soso*, *bobo*, *topo*, *soto* (*sotar*), *retozar*, *coz*, *hoz*, *Montoto* (place-name). Obviously, a strong learned reaction preserved or reintroduced *l* in place of the older *u*. There is no “law” whatever regulating these cases. Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. rom.*, II, 46, does not know what to say and concludes that “le rapport entre *l* et *u*, *u* est des plus obscurs dans la péninsule ibérique.” Hanssen, *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana* (Halle a. S., 1913), simply distorts the facts: “*al* pasa generalmente [*sic!*] por *au* y llega a ser *o*: *saltum* > *soto* . . . Hay excepciones [*sic!*]: *alto*, *alba*, *caldo*, *altro*.”

enter victoriously into the legitimate paragraphs of the *regular sound-changes*, and the formerly *regular* words or forms or sounds will shamefacedly join the bleak troop of the *exceptions* or *foreign borrowings*.<sup>3</sup> Only a generation devoid of the most elementary philosophical conceptions—as was that of the neo-grammarians—could reach such peaks of ridiculous nonsense.

Theoretically absurd and undefendable, as I said, the delusion of the phonetic law is moreover a most tricky and dangerous instrument of investigation. Languages are spoken by living beings, not by robots, as the neo-grammarians think (both the old ones and the new ones); and these living beings construct and reconstruct and change and adapt their speech incessantly, without any respect for etymologies, historical grammars or phonetic laws. They are conscious (more or less so, but certainly conscious) of their own individuality, and they construct or reconstruct new forms all the time, according to what they think these should be. So the Sardinian speaker, for instance, knowing that in many cases he pronounces *dz* where the Italian (Tuscan) speaker pronounces *-gli-* (*-l-*), as e.g. in Sard. *fidzu* = Italian *figlio* (AIS, 9), will say also *tanadza* for Italian *tanaglia* (AIS, 224), *agudza* for Italian *aguglia*; and since Italian *figlio* is from Latin *filium*, this will immediately lead us, always under the illuminating leadership of the phonetic law, to such beautiful reconstructions as Latin *\*tenālia*, *\*acūlia*, etc. (instead of *\*tenācla*, *acūcla* etc.). *S'io dico il ver, l'effetto nol nasconde*.<sup>4</sup>

I cannot now go on examining all the fallacies of the neo-grammarian doctrine, nor present a full description of the neo-linguistic doctrines,<sup>5</sup>

3. Moreover, some sounds or forms are extremely rare (how many words containing *au* have passed from Latin to Romance? how many *-ps-*? or *-bl-*? or *-gl-*? or *-fl-*?); so that it is not rare at all (as a matter of fact, very common) to see a pompous phonetic law based on five or six more or less doubtful examples; nay, even one or two. If these few examples disappear, or are replaced by "foreign" words, or suffer an accident by popular etymology, metathesis, or any other reason whatever, the whole *phonetic law*, the basis of all our knowledge, is shattered or disappears.

4. Another instance—out of hundreds of them, which can be found anywhere—is Sardinian *istandzu* 'tin', formed on the model of Ital. *stagno* (*gn* = *n*) according to the proportion Ital. *vigna* (AIS, 1304) = Sardinian *bindza* from Latin *vineam*. Sardinian *istandzu* will therefore regularly lead the neo-grammarians to a Latin *\*staneum*, instead of the attested *stagnum* (which according to the sacred laws, should give *\*istannu* in Sardinia; cf. Latin *ligna* = Sardinian *linna*, Italian *legna* AIS, 541, etc.). It was (I think) an American scholar (perhaps Maurice Bloomfield) who first said that the phonetic law is nothing else but the extension of *hyperurbanism* (a purely neo-linguistic statement); I do not know whether he was aware that he thereby condemned it definitely as an instrument of investigation.

5. The more so, as I have done this (although in an incomplete way, due to the limited purpose of that article) in the second number of the new journal *Word* (New York, 1945). That article, bearing the title "On Reconstruction and Linguistic Method," shows how "predictions" (I prefer to say "reconstructions," since linguistics is not astrology) can be made most successfully with the neo-linguistic method, but not with that of the neo-grammarians (or to be exact: the neo-grammarians do them, but the results are fallacious, which is even worse).



nor defend the neo-linguists from Hall's unwarranted attacks;<sup>6</sup> this has been done exhaustively by Bàrtoli, Bertoni and other scholars, and after all Hall does not contribute any new argument or fact to the discussion (as he admits himself). It was merely my intention to show here *some* of the reasons why neo-linguists reject the dogma of the phonetic law. I will only remark that by now in almost all countries<sup>7</sup> most scholars do not even consider that such a problem exists, and entirely agree with such statements as that of Iorgu Iordan in his excellent *Introduction to Romance Linguistics* (translated and in part recast by John Orr), London, 1937, p. 386 (in the Conclusion):

We have spoken above of fresh enlightenment and a new outlook. We refer first of all to the problem of the sound-laws. Nearly all the scholars we have discussed in the preceding pages have been opponents of the neo-grammarians, or, what is really the same, of the sound-laws, for, in general, it is the attitude of a linguist to this problem which stamps him as a traditionalist or the reverse. From the first, the neo-grammarians encountered hostility in various quarters, both Indo-European and Romance, but it was from the latter that they received the heaviest blows, and no scholars did more to shake belief in the infallibility of phonetic laws as conceived by the neo-grammarians than Schuchardt, who was their adversary from the beginning, and Gilliéron, whose close contact with the realities of language made him their most formidable opponent. Freed from the shackles of the sound-laws, linguistics has moved onwards, its scope has widened, and understanding has deepened; it works in a new atmosphere; and this, in a large measure, is due to the efforts of Romance scholars.<sup>8</sup>

G. BONFANTE

Princeton University

I hope to deal also very soon with the relationship between the *neo-grammarians* and *phonemics*, showing that the neo-grammarian theories are equally undefendable from the phonemic point of view.

6. When Hall says the neo-linguistic norms are "confused" and "mutually contradictory," he simply proves, either that he has not read them with attention (as W. M. Austin has not either), or that he does not understand Italian well enough (as Bertoni already remarked in *Archivum Romanicum*, xxii [1938], p. 582). Bàrtoli's norms (as he clearly states and repeats) must be applied *one after the other one, in the proper order*; they are as mutually contradictory as two successive acts of Congress the first of which states that all men between 20 and 30 shall be drafted; the second that however the men between 20 and 30 who have more than six children shall *not* be drafted. No jurist will find the slightest contradiction, the problem being solved and the situation perfectly clear; there never will be any doubt whatever.

7. The neo-grammarian theories (and in particular the idea of phonetic law) were in reality never widely accepted outside of Germany; in Italy they found immediately a staunch enemy in Graziadio Isaia Ascoli. But even in Germany they were strongly attacked from the beginning: some of the most outspoken critics of the neo-grammarians, such as Schuchardt and Vossler, are Germans.

8. On Meyer-Lübke in particular, see Iordan, pp. 30 ff.; on the neo-grammarians in general, pp. 15 ff.

I will of course refrain entirely from discussing the problems of "practical language teaching," of "the limits of patience" of Mr. Bloomfield, and others which Mr. Hall brings in, and which have nothing to do with my article, nor with scholarship in general.



## REVIEWS

*Lope de Vega: El sembrar en buena tierra. A Critical and Annotated Edition of the Autograph Manuscript.* By William L. Fichter. New York, Modern Language Association of America (London, Oxford University Press), 1944. Pp. xiv + 247.

Mr. Fichter's edition of this *autógrafo* is important on at least three distinct scores. It provides opportunity of observing almost at first hand, and at a moment of perhaps climactic creative proficiency, the physical minutiae of Lope's somewhat variable process of composition. It not only presents a thoroughly trustworthy transcription of Lope's original text—in itself a precious contribution, especially since the Academy and Baig Baños editions consistently fail to attain this objective—, but it also makes available, in handy and pleasant format, an exceptionally significant play which on its own merit constitutes a focal point for the still neglected study of Lope's realism. In generous addition to this, Mr. Fichter's exemplary patience in research, his long-standing and intimate acquaintance with the *comedia* of Lope and his contemporaries, his fine sense of values, and his editorial integrity and meticulousness combine to make this book in many respects a model of its kind. The Modern Language Association, aided by a grant from the Hispanic Society, has made it Volume xvii of its General Series. It is the first work in Spanish literature to be there included, and one hopes, in view of the great number of seventeenth-century Spanish dramas which still cry eloquently for *lebensraum*, that it will not be the last. But it will be properly difficult for subsequent editors to compete with the quality of this auspicious inauguration.

After critically describing the autograph manuscript, the five printed editions, and three manuscript copies, with particularly interesting observations on the text of the first *Décima Parte* (Madrid, 1618), the thirty-four page Introduction provides a useful synopsis of the play and devotes the remaining two-thirds of its attention to literary appraisal. This criticism includes a survey of previous comment, Mr. Fichter's own evaluation, and a comparison with four other Lopean plays of related theme, *La prueba de los amigos* (1604), *El desdén vengado* (1617), *Quien todo lo quiere* (1620), and *Porfiando vence amor* (1624–1626). *El sembrar en buena tierra* was finished January 6, 1616. Long unappreciated, especially by romanticists, it distinguishes itself from these other plays in which friendship, patient fidelity and quixotic generosity are glorified—the list could be extended—by majoring in background and sharp characterization, and by reaching an almost incredibly high point of realism. In view of its duly recognized and perhaps unprecedented emancipation from *capa y espada* elements, Mr. Fichter's characteristically measured eulogy (“one of Lope's outstanding *comedias* of manners . . . in language and dialogue . . . Lope at his best . . . the height of straightforward realism in his theatre”) might even seem to border a bit on understatement.

The unlikelihood of Lope's achieving so perfectly unadulterated a form of dramatic expression without appreciable evidence of this realistic tendency in plays written either just before or just after *Sembrar* makes the omission of comparison with other plays of about the same date, plays that do not treat the same theme, perhaps the most regrettable hiatus in Mr. Fichter's work. To trace the course of realism through all of Lope's plays would doubtless demand a whole study in itself, but, even if more or less tentative, some statement regarding the immediately contingent phenomena within a radius of three to five years would have been of no little service. Even a summary of an authoritative analysis along this line might well confirm other evidence of the chronological position of plays whose exact date has not yet been established. In *Sembrar*, the simplicity and naturalness of the plot contribute immeasurably to the general impression of verisimilitude and no doubt decorously circumscribed Lope's admirably unaffected style in this play. But even in such widely different subjects as, for instance, those presented by *Fuente Ovejuna* and *Amar sin saber a quién*—both, it should be noted, extremely difficult to make acceptably convincing, and both, in my opinion, written fairly close to 1616—one is unmistakably impressed by the seemingly gratuitous abundance of purely realistic material. Lope often meets the challenge constantly presented by his various historical, traditional and novelistic sources by setting extraordinary and impossible behavior against a substantial background of familiar thoughts and preoccupations. The work at hand at least demonstrates that by 1616 he had developed such virtuosity in projecting an atmosphere of actuality that he could create a whole play—and, thanks to crisp, lively dialogue, an excellent one—out of merely the commonplaces of unvarnished experience in the world of *galanes* and *damas*. That Mr. Fichter mentions no other source of this *comedia* than Lope's own *La prueba de los amigos* may be explained by the fact that there was none beyond Lope's own shrewd observation and this very natural reminiscence of an already tested pattern, and none was needed. One is inclined to suspect that, by the law of compensation, there may be a very close and logical relationship between a pre-eminently realistic treatment and a plot of Lope's own invention. Lope's greatest dramatic gift is probably not, as is Vélez's, the intensely direct pursuit of inexorable action, but his genius for giving a simple plot substantial body and credibility. That the density of a play's realism, of its literalness and pictorial integrity, might provide some index to its date of composition would moreover be quite consistent with Lope's procedure in other regards. Within the plasticity of his formula he could meet the demands of incessant productivity only by cultivating effective veins of expression and procedure—through trial and error—quite intensively for at least certain periods. Recent studies of his sonnets and versification, as Mr. Fichter recognizes in one of his most valuable observations (page 218), "have made it clear that our poet-dramatist often tended to employ a mannerism for a limited time only, thereafter favoring it less or discarding it altogether." Although this penetrating remark is made

apropos of a single favorite expression (the *Más precio* formula), it could, I believe, be pertinently extended to illustrate this tendency in the larger aspects of Lope's craftsmanship. Mr. Fichter himself has provided a measuring-stick which for gauging realism, and with *Sembrar* as a point of reference, might be applied to other plays with some mathematically tangible results. He suggestively notices (page 13) that in *Sembrar* "similes, metaphors, aphorisms, proverbial sayings, wordplay and other similar means for giving color and body to the dialogue are employed to such an extent as to involve more than one fourth of the total number of verses," and that the frequency of such filler (easily mistaken for whimsically errant digression) declines in Act III—precisely as might be expected once its duly recognized mission has been fulfilled. "It was perhaps inevitable," it is justly observed, "that in a work which stresses character more than action and which includes three such shrewd and realistically minded persons as Prudencia, Florencio and Galindo [Don Alonso and all the minor characters, and occasionally even Celia, likewise have this same common denominator, almost always colored with Lope's peculiarly delightful *socarronería*] the dramatist should have been more than ordinarily concerned with thought and expression." The directly proportionate relationship between such material and a dominant realism would indeed seem quite undeniable. If *Sembrar*'s chronologically closest neighbors were likewise submitted to a percentile count of lines exclusively devoted to subject matter which at first sight does not appear essential to the immediate advancement of the plot, the yield, even if negative, would provide a set of statistics of great interest and considerable utility. Its scenic structure, its partial and rather unexpected concession to the unities of both time and place, its scrupulous restriction of extended passages of time to the intervals between acts (cf. *Arte nuevo*, lines 193-199, 213-214), compose a sympathetic corollary to the realistic treatment of this whole play, and might likewise possess some chronological value if compared with the phenomena of Lope's immediately contemporary comedias for analogy. Is not the straightforward style of *Sembrar*, at 1616 even less likely to be an isolated instance, the expected reflection of Lope's conscious responsibility as captain of *llaneza* in opposition to *culto* forces? This inclination to play safe, to lean over backwards stylistically, should also be charted for chronological movements. Mr. Fichter is quite aware that "In his avoidance of the 'metafóricas violencias' . . . Lope too often approached the opposite extreme of the prosaic and the commonplace" (page 14, note 4), but he does not sufficiently indicate the likelihood of Lope's intense pursuit of this direction in any particular year or group of years. The number of *retruécanos*, perhaps still another clue for dating the composition of other plays, seems extraordinarily high in *Sembrar*. Counting twenty-six that have not been noted, they reach at least sixty-five. However, as regards merely the figurative passages, Mr. Fichter thinks that while they "do seem to be more numerous than in some Lopean plays, they are probably no more so than in many of Lope's best comedias."

As have almost all previous editors of *comedias*, including those of the critical *Teatro Antiguo Español* which since 1916 has maintained the standard plan for supplementary apparatus, Mr. Fichter, except for a statement regarding Lope's general practice from 1604 to 1630, has limited his analysis of the versification to tables indicating the distribution of the various forms employed, the number of lines in each, and their percentages. The sentiments of the undersigned regarding the inadequacy of such a purely mechanical survey of a play's accompaniment, especially in so exquisitely musical an artist as Lope, may be read at some length in a review of Morley and Bruerton's *Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias* (*Hisp. Rev.*, xi, 338-353). That Lope could have been insensitive to the relative appropriateness of one rhythm over another, or to the theatrical advantage of capitalizing the suggestive power of meters properly adjusted to their respective scenes, is an intolerable fallacy which no editor really familiar with his man could venture to maintain, at least without gross insult to his author's artistic alertness. Even within their admitted limitations, the statistics presented by Morley-Bruerton constitute so amazingly efficient an instrument for fixing an uncertain date of composition that editorial satisfaction with strictly objective data is quite understandable, particularly in a play that does not itself depend upon them. But mathematical measurements obviously fall too short of telling the whole story of a play's versification to warrant one's stopping there. I know no *comedia* by Lope in which as a rule the verse form chosen for a particular passage is not appreciably fitted either to the subject matter, the characters, or the locale involved. A ten percent margin for error in the event of insoluble or merely perplexing passages would, I suppose, be a most generous estimate. To register the emotional or atmospheric content of a scene is, frankly, a highly subjective exercise and demands a good deal of literary tact and psychological penetration. And the ability to probe to the determinate core of a *paso* may be an embarrassing index of one's grasp of the quintessence of a scene or indeed of a whole play, especially for pioneers. But even at the risk of some scholastic disagreement, the effort must be systematically made for at least every exactly dated *comedia*. This delicate analysis would not be as unreliably impressionistic as might at first be charged, but it could be made only with the most minute scrutiny, and should be definitively accepted only after confirmation by analogous usage in other plays. Even a very random experience in this field convinces me that if one listens patiently and intently enough, the master tone of a passage, often revealed by key words, may be heard with rewarding clarity. Since this can obviously be done best by the man most authoritatively familiar with the text under examination, the responsibility for this task must be met largely by individual editors. Mr. Fichter's admirable equipment for research requiring wide acquaintance with metrical analogues in other plays—and his potential influence on less practiced Lopistas—makes his apparent indifference to a qualitative analysis of this fundamental element of Lope's theatre a second major omission and to me a matter of profound disappointment.

The very date and nature of *Sembrar* would seem to render it ideal testing ground both for the validity of the guide-lines offered in Lope's generally underestimated *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias* and for their more specific extension. In the space at hand one may at least emphasize the perfect harmony between the simplicity and comparative uneventfulness of *Sembrar's* versification and its essentially characteristic realism. The high point reached by the latter corresponds exactly, and logically, with the high point reached by *Sembrar's* *redondillas*, the most natural meter for straightforward action and dialogue, and here consistently devoted to an almost prosaic treatment of *cosas de amor*. In previous plays positively known to have been written by Lope in 1611 or after, the number of *redondillas* in *Sembrar* (57.19%) is surpassed only by those in *El villano en su rincón* (1611), *San Diego de Alcalá* (1613), and *De cuando acá nos vino* (1612-1614), and in subsequent plays only by those in *Lo que pasa en una tarde* (1617). These sporadic rises (cf. Morley-Bruerton, pages 26-31) are motivated, I believe, less by the moment of composition than by the content and manner of the play itself. Of the plays known to be chronologically closest to *Sembrar*, *Al pasar del arroyo*, written 23 days after, drops its *redondillas* 6.8% and *Quien más no puede*, 9 months later, drops 24.4%, while *Santiago el Verde*, 26 days before, is 15.8% lower, exactly as is *La portuguesa* (1615-1616), and *Dos estrellas trocadas*, probably not more than 40 days before, is 21.2% lower. On the other hand, it should be observed that the 64.3% of *redondillas* in *San Diego*, 3 years earlier, is in perfect consonance with the impression which Lope, in his remarkably faithful treatment of his protagonist, is clearly most anxious to make. The keynote to *San Diego's* character is his modest simplicity. And Lope's handling of his subject is characterized, precisely as in *Sembrar*, by a remarkable realism. In both plays the extraordinary number of *redondillas* is to me a clear reflection of the author's attitude toward his material, and in *San Diego*, by subtle translation, of the saint himself as described in Lope's source: "Su vestido era muy pobre y áspero, los pies siempre descalzos; y, en efeto, su hábito, trage y compostura exterior era una imagen de la mortificación interior y de la honestidad de su alma." This quotation from Rivadeneyra's *Flos Sanctorum* might be taken verbatim as a figurative description of the versification with which Lope invests this earlier play. Moreover, it cannot be fortuitous that Mr. Fichter's appreciation of *Sembrar's* realism should coincide so closely with the observation regarding the essential mood of *San Diego* which Menéndez y Pelayo makes in his *Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega* (II, 62). The latter felt that "la familiaridad con que trata [Lope] su argumento puede . . . tener visos de irreverencia," but nevertheless admired Lope's realistic virtuosity here: "todo con tal viveza de color y ausencia de artificio, que la ilusión teatral se confunde con la realidad, y hasta los milagros, puestos en escena de un modo directo y grosero, parece que entran en el orden natural de las cosas humanas, borrándose las fronteras del mundo sobrenatural por virtud de la potencia plástica y naturalista del poeta." Even this one point of contact suggests a line of pro-

cedure which might profitably be continued, though of course much more minutely than can here be demonstrated.

Since *redondillas*, a sort of G.I. meter, are used by Lope largely to handle the ordinary business of a plot, their specific employment in *Sembrar* need not be further examined. However, Lope's virtuosity in this plastic medium is probably nowhere more beautifully illustrated. Even these *redondillas* constantly prompt the essential question regarding his metrical infallibility: "What other verse form would have been more appropriate to the passage at hand?" There is almost always a perceptible reason for Lope's choice, and his metrical tact may be proved quite satisfactorily by working backwards with this interrogative measuring stick. For instance, in what other form than its straightforward *redondillas* could Prudencia's unaffected frankness and Félix's clean reply (1966-2002-2032) have been so adequately expressed? The excitement of what Prudencia expects to be a *desafío* might have been enhanced by a *romance* setting (see *infra*), but at almost the beginning of a third act, as Lope must instinctively have known, it is far better dramatic economy to keep such a scene on a rational rather than an emotional plane. Besides, we have here merely a disillusioning statement of situation, not the sort of a plea that invites a *romance*, and little real conflict. The keynote of this passage is its *libertad* (cf. 2009), a word that might provide a fine criterion for a good many *redondillas*.

The more interesting and less comprehensible verse forms are of course those that rise above the general level of normal procedure, not only to register the more theatrical emotions, but to mark a climax or some decisive turn in the action. Mr. Fichter's fine remarks on plot construction and style (pages 32-33) do reveal his consciousness of rather well-defined trends, but the intrinsic connection of these elements with their concomitant verse forms has not been considered. A study of the structural function of various meters remains still another major desideratum.

Of *Sembrar*'s six *romance* passages, three close an act, and thus illustrate a usage whose perfunctoriness may perhaps appear too familiar now to warrant further notice in a critical edition. The reason the *romance* form appealed to Lope as the most essentially appropriate for such places is not however clearly established. It deserves some examination, even if conclusions remain rather conjectural. Students of *comedia* meters seem to have forgotten their *romances viejos*. But Lope, constantly inspired by the subjects of the traditional ballads, must have inseparably associated their effectively inconclusive fragmentation and their intensely dramatic quality with the verse form in which they are set. Certainly here in 1616 he fully appreciates its fitness for moments of concentrated conflict and for high points of action. With it he could draw from his audience an emotional response quite superior to that obtainable with *redondillas*, and from 1610 on (cf. Morley-Bruerton, pages 117-118) he almost regularly used the *romance* form at the end of acts, surely not, as Buchanan has conjectured, to warn his audience of an approaching curtain—Lope was theatrically too sophisticated and practical and far too alert to suspense-values for that (cf.



*Arte nuevo*, 234-239)—, but rather to divert suspicion of handy finality by assuming a sensibly more irregular and exciting pace than that provided by the more fluent *redondillas*. At the end of Act III it was of course particularly advisable to stimulate the audience a bit more than normally and so, as far as possible, to counteract—not encourage—the restlessness that inevitably attends a realization of impending conclusion. Moreover in *Sembrar* and in most *comedias*, the *romance* at the end of the play, with its more or less official statement regarding the ultimate disposition of all characters, is virtually little more than a *relación* animated and disguised with dialogue. Lope's ingenuity in developing the *relación* beyond the awkward monologue of address with which it has been principally identified enabled him to increase the number of his *romance* lines and the number of *romance* passages within his acts. An anthology of the great moments, of the most emotionally impressive scenes, in Lope's theatre would be largely an anthology of such internal *romance* passages. These would include not only such tirades as Lauencia's stirring speech to the town council in *Fuente Ovejuna*, but such insuperably dialogued drama as the elemental conflict between mother and daughter in *De cuándo acá nos vino?* (*Acad. N.*, XI, 689b-691b). That both of these scenes mark a climactic turn in their respective plots is not accidental. That Lope employed these and other *romance* passages simply because he needed at a certain point to shift his action into a higher gear, and not because he had been accustomed during a certain period to inject more or less the same amount of this verse form in almost every play, is evidenced in *Sembrar* by the precision with which his three internal *romance* passages have been inserted. Of these, despite an easily detected parentage, none is a pure or superficially recognizable *relación*, but in every case their functional value in relation to the whole play is as incontestable as is their individual merit at the moment. They appear in their respective acts only when the action starts to mount to a decisively high point, and, with noteworthy timing, this regularly occurs just about half-way through—6 lines after the middle point in Act I, 11 lines before it in II, and 50 lines before it in III. To cite a single but immediate analogue, *Santiago el Verde*, just before *Sembrar*, is credited by Morley-Bruerton with eight *romance* passages to the latter's six. However, its last two, at the end of Act III and in the same assonance, are separated only by a sonnet—not delivered in the complete isolation to which this form is accustomed, but while one character watches the approach of another, previously noticed and avoided by exiting characters—, and thus they form almost a single passage. If so counted, *Santiago* would have only one more *romance* passage than *Sembrar*. Though cunningly broken into dialogue, and incidentally revealing a bit of character, this extra passage (1250-1321) is virtually a *relación* telling a stranger about the titular fiesta and how to get there. The other *romances*, more strictly structural, correspond exactly to those in *Sembrar*. The conflict and suspense at the end of *Santiago's* Act I are unmistakably analogous to those achieved by *Sembrar's* *romance* at the end of Act II. Moreover *Santiago's* three other internal *romances* are strik-



ingly similar in timing, function and character to the three internal *romances* of *Sembrar*, and likewise fall close to the middle point of their respective acts, ending 86 lines after in I (beginning 121 lines before), 34 before in II and 89 before in III. Lope's sense of proportion regarding passage length is curiously evidenced by the three terminal *romances* of *Santiago* (192-202-198 lines), but this regularity is not so closely observed in *Sembrar* (126-66-144).

At this period *redondillas* and *romances* (rather than *quintillas*) are the wheel-horses of *comedia* versification. But the latter pull a heavier load and consequently must generally be employed for shorter stretches. For uphill work they are decidedly superior. Together these two forms are very largely responsible for the more legitimate handling of directly organic action, and thus account for eighty-seven percent of so untheatrical and so lyrically undecorative a play as *Sembrar*. What is vulgarly known as "corn"—conspicuously absent in *Sembrar*—is least likely to be set in these meters once Lope has achieved his mastery of them, as he has by 1616. As in *Sembrar*, both may be convincingly used for satire, for they have the impress of sincerity and integrity, but usually not for meretricious floridity. To move a scene on to a more exalted plane, the *romance* logically shifts to *octavas*, whose dignified and naturally heroic movement may easily be exaggerated into bombast or melodrama, but when held in perfect control, as here, may provide an exquisitely sharp instrument of irony. At the regular stages of dramatic stress and strain the less forceful *redondillas* are in the best of Lope quite properly and consistently relieved by *romances*. These are the two straight meters, and substitutes (especially *quintillas*, *décimas*, *sextillas*) will be used only to invest a passage with higher lyric values than they can inspire. In that event the action will, by the law of compensation, slow down and for the moment perhaps even halt, for emotion is often lost motion. The poignantly emotional effects of Lope's matured *romance* must not however be confused with the largely operatic appeal of his *romance relaciones* or of his secondary forms, the latter rarely comparable in length and usually as carefully differentiated from each other as they are from the *romance* itself. The point that needs most to be stressed regarding Lope's versification, and which is perhaps most eloquently manifested by *Sembrar*, is, I think, that his *romance* has become strategically functional and now reflects him at his dramatic best, as he himself probably knew. The *romance* passages of *Sembrar* seem to me unexcelled in their genre, but I would confirm this impression of their value as a medium of climactic suspense—and that is the critical test of all drama—by a careful study of, for instance, that at the end of *El caballero de Olmedo*. When the percentage of Lope's *romances* increases from play to play, their graph presents undeniable chronological evidence; but, with proper allowance for formal and interrupted *relaciones*, is not this largely because Lope himself has grown more essentially dramatic, more forceful and incisive, in the choice and presentation of his scenes, even when they major in high comedy? Has he not in these plays simply selected, perhaps intuitively, the meter most likely to succeed?

That a drama such as *El caballero de Olmedo*, dated by Morley-Bruerton with a rather wide spread (between 1615-1626; probably 1620-1625) displays an unusually high *romance* content would seem best explained by the fact that it is a tragedy, and consequently needs and invites the gripping intensity that this meter most readily contributes. *Sembrar* may seem at times, particularly in Act III, stylistically flat, as Mr. Fichter suggests (pages 13, 31), but it is nevertheless first-rate drama. Those who would still maintain Lope's claim to *La Estrella de Sevilla* would do well to keep this play in mind, for the major objection to his authorship of *Estrella* is to some extent answered by the remarkably dynamic *llaneza* here employed.

It is particularly noteworthy that although they avoid the formality of set-pieces of *relación*, the *romance* passages of *Sembrar* are at times still recognizable as a masterly development of the narrative monologue or the monologue of address. The naturalness and fragmentation of their dialogue does not completely obscure their technical provenance. Note, for instance, the infiltration of news between 2383 and 2468. Elena's urgent account of what has happened to her mistress in the interim since 2324 (2471-2497) is here Lope's major and clearest concession to a convention in speeches which in other *comedias* is often awkwardly objectionable. But in the carefully articulated crescendo of the penultimate *romance* passage it forms only one section, the climax. These lines are probably the "monologue of address" listed by Morley-Bruerton (page 44), for they cite *Sembrar* as one of the thirteen plays between 1609 and 1618 which, in spite of the greater importance of this meter, have no narrative monologue in *romance*. Perhaps less likely to be appreciated is Lope's predilection, especially around 1616, for *romance* in satirical passages, not only in full action, as in both scenes in which the *pedigüeña*, the pivotal character of *Sembrar*, actually displays her technique, but also in witty small-talk surveying contemporary conditions—often in the peripatetic and somewhat casual conversation of characters moving, even when constantly on stage, from one spot to another (cf. 848, 1607-1609). *Romance* is a telling meter in which to rebuke or scold, and to the protagonist such *discursos* may be annoying. Of the seventeen passages from other *comedias* cited in notes 545-586, 577-586 and 2727 ff. as parallels to the picture of Madrid life in the *romances* of *Sembrar*, thirteen are likewise in this meter (cf. 857-866; also *La portuguesa*, Acad. N., XIII, 341; *Amar sin saber a quién*, 2796-2828).

The success of *Sembrar* obviously does not depend upon its two sonnets and its one highly subjective *décima* passage or, despite their excellence and effective spacing, on its two sets of *octavas*. However, the *gravedad* of the latter is worthy of special attention. Each *octava* passage presents not only a particularly serious situation (the protagonist's degrading arrest for debt, the death of his father), but also serious characters, his highly respectable and dignified old father and the annoying *ministros* of his *grande agravio*, an *alguacil* and *escribano*. The likelihood that these officers of the law may have been invested with some mock solemnity is quite consistent with Lope's ironical treatment

of these unpopular types elsewhere. The officious constable and notary who in an analogously "desdichado y desgraciado punto" arrest the protagonist of *Amar sin saber a quién* are presented in a hendecasyllabic *silva* (Morley-Bruerton's number 3), but an interpolated section devoted especially to apprehending the *gracioso* (70-77) constitutes one perfect *octava*,<sup>1</sup> whose very non-conformity injects into this scene a still higher note of grotesqueness than even that registered by Mr. Buchanan (cf. notes 53-97 of his edition). At 661 in the same play, the pompous officers appear again, in a prison scene, but they are now introduced with *octavas*, which fall significantly into *suelos* as soon as their indignant victim frightens these bullies into civility. The unmarked exit of the Law should occur immediately after Don Fernando's scathingly ironical speech at 683-684. *Amar's* second arrest occurs at 350-360, but since this is justified and Don Fernando is here treated with all due courtesy (cf. 354, 358-359), in striking contrast to his later sense of outrage (cf. 661-664), the current verse form (*romance*) is accordingly not altered. Perhaps still more interesting is *Sembrar's* indirect use of *octavas* for a sort of counterpoint. In both passages it is the son that is on stage, not the *viejo*. The latter never actually appears, but through letters from Peru his spirit does dominate these scenes, and his death causes a pivotal turn in the action. His sententious paternal advice is itself very properly set in these *octavas*, but it also throws the infatuation of the unwary boy, with his punning determination to spend his money with Prudencia, into ironically high relief. As regards the logical relation of *romance* to *octavas*, still a moot question, Act II of *Sembrar* provides an admirable illustration of the ease and propriety with which the one naturally mounts to the other, especially when as here a distressingly critical situation grows from bad to worse (cf. the ironical line 1642: "A fine time for misfortune such as this!").

Though *Sembrar's* single passage of *décimas* does not immediately express the *quejas* for which Lope recommended this meter in his *Arte nuevo*, it does, in reverse, consistently embody the emotional excitation more or less essential to complaints, especially in lovers, and at the third stage (2679-2706) of its beautifully graduated and neatly symmetrical organization it does enable Prudencia to discharge a vengeful *disculpa* so incontestably recriminatory as to forestall the hereby rejected Alonso's potential *queja* and reduce it to a single exemplary line (2716) admitting his own folly. Elsewhere more clearly recognizable *quejas* are often followed by a defense likewise in *décimas* (cf. *Amar sin saber a quién*, 1412-1451, 2892-2921). Like his *octavas*, Lope's *décimas* are two-edged and with fine counterpoint they too may be used to express an extreme low as well as an extreme high, for the emotional common denominator need not be radically different. The cynical sententiousness which seems peculiarly to invite *décimas* caps each of the two major sections of *Sembrar's* passage (2645-2656, 2705-2706) and by way of conclusion now crystallizes,

1. Mr. Morley writes me that the "bad text for *décima*" cited in my review of the *Chronology* (*loc. cit.*, p. 353) refers not to these lines but to 806-813.

at precisely the most telling point, the mercenary creed and motivation of both of its principal characters: "... oro, hermosura y onor./Ese [money] viua y muera amor..." (2743-2746). With even finer reflection of character these *décimas* give the story of Prudencia and Alonso the same crucial lift that the immediately preceding *romance* gives the story of Celia and Felix. The sparing use of them throws them into high relief when they do occur. From the nature of *Sembrar*'s plot one would not expect another set, and this one instance is precisely the corrective that the more rapidly moving third act needs. A moment of effective suspense is thereby very prettily interjected between the climactic *romance* that precedes and the terminal *romance* that follows, the latter being used not to warn the public of the approaching end, but, by way of summarizing report, akin to a *relación*, to recapitulate and give information regarding such loose ends as the reward granted Florencio and Galindo. However, the most remarkable asset of the *décimas* in *Sembrar* is their psychological value. Though their first section (2567-2656) includes some purely lyric lines, and some with which Prudencia seems almost to sing from sheer joy (cf. 2580-2583), they are by no means out of place even in this still mundane setting. Next to the sonnet, of which in tone and function it may often be regarded as a *bizarro* amplification, the *décima* is not only the smartest and most brilliant meter, but also the most emotionally subjective. It is *par excellence* the verse form for ladies of fashion and *discretos*, of superficiality and vanity, and in *Sembrar* it has been used as a subtle vehicle for precipitating the disastrous consequences of *discreción* carried to an extreme. By some anticipatory magic there comes with these *décimas* the definitive realization that, despite the ironical connotation of her name, Prudencia has out-smarted herself. The poetic justice of the final *romance* passage—note the frequency with which reprises of proverbial titles are cast in *romance*—is only what we here intuitively learn to expect. The competence of *décimas* for the expression of blind egotism seems with this passage in *Sembrar* to be firmly established. Its second section, with a concise confirmatory parallel (2657-2678), displays the mercurial Don Alonso, Prudencia's male counterpart, as suffering from much the same delusions of glamor and the same unscrupulous acquisitiveness. That Lope regarded *décimas*, a highly demoniac form, as appropriate not only for autointoxication, as here, but also for its polar and even more destructive opposite, *desesperación* (sometimes temptation to commit suicide) is convincingly attested by his *El saber por no saber* (Acad., v, 222-223; cf. Segismundo's famous *décimas* in *La vida es sueño*, 102 ff.). As an essentially aristocratic form—this would partially explain their fitness for pervertedly depicting egotism and snobbishness and pastoral disdain—*décimas* also provide a particularly appropriate setting for the description of exquisite things, not only the loveliness of nature but costly raiment and fine jewelry. Adhering to this association, Prudencia's moment of exaltation, significantly unique in *Sembrar*, is inspired by her dazzled belief that she can now possess fabulous wealth from the Indies (note Alonso's less breathless but corresponding lines at 2669-

2676). For once she loses contact with reality, and, despite the simplicity of her language, her excited, relatively high-flown *décimas* betray the fallacious motivation for her subsequent and humiliating action, likewise duplicated by that of Alonso ("¡Qué mal el gusto resisto! ¡Oy vnas Yndias conquisto, oy es todo para mí!"). Lope's consciousness of such *décima* values is analogously evidenced in the similarly unique *décima* passage of *Santiago el Verde*, already cited for other metrical correspondence with *Sembrar*. In the second section (2322–2381) of that passage—the first, at once recognizable as the conventional lyric monologue, is quite different in character: a plaintive apostrophe to Love and really a glorified sonnet—Don Rodrigo attempts to dazzle Celia with a flattering account of the rich Italian and Grenadine stuffs which he intends to bestow on her as bridal finery, but, despite her disillusioning declaration regarding "el mayor tesoro," he is too fatuously self-centered to realize the vanity of his position, and we now intuitively know that his hopes of marrying her will not materialize. These *décimas* would seem to be used, precisely as in *Sembrar*, for the representation of a foolishly superficial character, and incidentally for suggesting the lure of wealth.

Morley-Bruerton repeatedly cite *Sembrar* as a point of departure, as having fewer changes in verse form (18) than any other dated play after 1606, but neither they nor Mr. Fichter, who likewise observes this deviation from Lope's normal practice (page 32), have noticed the essential relationship between this passage record and the play's extraordinary realism. The comparatively uncomplicated nature of its story and Lope's straightforward manner of telling it would, however, seem to compel the minimizing of metrical shifts. Certainly this is one of the missing factors that would compensate for statistical gaps, and thus partially reconcile *Sembrar*'s metrical architecture to that of Lope's other 1615–1616 plays, to the 35 passages of *Las dos estrellas trocadas*, the 28 of the custombristic *Santiago el Verde*, the 26 of *Al pasar del arroyo* (less realistic than *Sembrar* but more so than *Santiago*), and the 31 of *Quien más no puede*.

One could say much more about each of the verse forms here employed, and one should of course go much further in the pursuit of metrical analogues. However the above will, I hope, be sufficient to give some idea of the sort of thing which I believe should be attempted in an analysis of a *comedia*'s versification. As regards that of *Sembrar*, I feel that nowhere could a different meter be substituted for the one actually employed without some loss in decorous adjustment. One could find few *comedias* in which the versification is so constantly and perfectly attuned to the spirit and matter of its story.

Mr. Fichter's eighty-two pages of Notes embody a considerable contribution to our more exact understanding of Lope and *Siglo de Oro* literature, especially as regards characteristic facets of thought and expression and the reflection of contemporary life. Their reference value in itself commands some superlative expression of gratitude. Particularly detailed and enlightening are the well-indexed notes on Lope's preterite plural ending *-tes*, his tempered censure of women, his use of *ge* for *gue*, his specially rubricated line for pointing

out a vacant stage—in *Sembrar* always coincident, it might be added, with a change in the action's locale—, his use of the conjunction *u* replacing *o*, hiatus before an initial secondary accent, the figurative use of *treinta*, Quevedo's influence on Lope, Lope's initial *j* for *y*, and the pious ascription with which his plays always conclude. Generally Mr. Fichter's liberal annotation has been too carefully deliberated to be questionable as regards facts and, as is the case with his Introduction, criticism must, at the risk of appearing carpingly greedy, be restricted largely to what he has chosen not to say. In view of the nature of the edition, as the preface declares, no attempt has been made to explain the commoner aspects of Lope's language and usage. The assumption that the reader will already be more or less familiar with the hardy perennials of *Siglo de Oro* annotation may be fallaciously wishful, but it constitutes a major premise which it is high time to recognize as soundly commendable. The lost motion recently observed in perfunctory "critical" editions of other *comedias* is particularly lamentable in a field where so many uncharted phenomena remain to be noted. On the other hand, the danger of limiting a *comedia's* public to specialists makes the question of selection a matter of the most exquisite editorial tact, and sometimes of debate. Mr. Fichter's prefatory concern regarding excessive diffuseness and his very familiarity with this and other texts may have led him to believe on a few occasions that passages left unannotated are less significant or difficult than they really are. I would amplify or disagree in interpretation at the following points.

388. Some stage directions may be found in which *entra* does denote exit. See Acad. v, 55b, 226b; Acad. N., xi, 332b, 257a; BAE, XLV, 57c, 102b, 152b, 398c; Vélez, *Serrana*, 916+ (inconsistent, however, with usage at 909+ and 922+); Schaeffer, *Ocho comedias*, II, 195, 215; Guillén de Castro, *Ingratitud por amor*, 860+; Caravajal, *Bandolera de Flandes*, 852+, 3406+. In a preterite referring to an exit made shortly before (even with *Entranse*) and with inceptive auxiliaries or *al* it seems still more common (cf. BAE, XLV, 153c, 182b, 592a, 592b, 592c; *Caballero de Olmedo*, 2253+). There is a case of *entrarse* meaning to enter in Solís, *Amor y obligación*, 1229+. A study of stage directions now in progress reveals some rather sharply defined distinctions in the use of verbs, but even as regards those in *Sembrar* the subject is too complicated for discussion here. However in a play so consistently subjunctive everywhere else, the two suspiciously intruding indicatives, *Todos se ban* (920+) and *Vase* (2312+) demand some attention. Mr. Fichter has kindly re-examined his manuscript on this point and writes me that though these verbs still seem to be in Lope's hand, there is a possible explanation for both. Circumstances not mentioned in the footnotes suggest that the former may have been an after-thought, and that Lope's preference for the latter, rather than for the expected but longer *Váyase*, was prescribed by the exigencies of a very narrow space at the right edge of the page. It is noteworthy that, as is frequently the case in other *comedias*, the *Todos* at 920 is quite inexact and really means "All the others." In the stage direction supplied at 586+, *Entre* would be more con-



sistent with Lope's usage in *Sembrar* than is "Sale," at 275 *Váyase* would be better than "Vase," and at 1655 I should prefer *Éntrense* to "Váyanse" (cf. 388, 2446).

553-554. The immediately following allusion to death suggests that *perdidos ya los estribos* may be a witty perversion of the familiar "Puesto ya el pie en el estribo, / con las ansias de la muerte . . . pues no puedo vivo . . ." Lope used this *copla antigua* elsewhere (cf. the Schevill-Bonilla ed. of Cervantes' *Persiles*, I, 326-327).

556. Since the horses are too emaciated even to budge the coach, *tiran* might be translated "they pull on it" rather than "they pull to pieces," which would demand a reflexive form. However, inasmuch as this coach is *de la muerte*, a preferable interpretation would seem one based on *tirar* in its sense of "Durar alguna cosa, o mantenerse sin decaer del estado en que se halla; y así suele decirse de un enfermo que va tirando" (*Dicc. Aut.*). The connotation of mortal infirmity is supported in 558 by *encerados*, a plaster, as Covarruvias says, "para aplicar al cuerpo y sacarle algún frío." The line, then, would mean that without trying to pull a coach, such skeleton horses have all they can do to hold out against death itself (the first *le*). But the word-play may well be twofold. The idea of the coach of Death could have been obliquely inspired by Barriónuevo's *Triunfo de los coches*, probably written in 1611 but published in Lope's *Octava Parte*, whose first *aprobación* is dated June 16, 1616. With extraordinary insistence on the nautical figure of 545-550, this *entremés* calls the coach not only a "galera despalmada, sin velas ni remos, sino con proa y popa, comitre y forzados," but also "nave de la tierra y bagaje del cielo." Moreover, its protagonist would insist in her will "que me lleven en coche en lugar de andas o ataúd; y aun si no fuera indecente, quisiera que el coche me sirviera de túmulo y aun de sepultura"; and in desperation not unrelated to that of Prudencia in 540-542, she invokes death ("¡Muerte, ven y llévame!") when she learns that the coach, elsewhere described as "una segunda cruz del matrimonio" (cf. 243), has been sold. She also tells of a friend who died in perfect contentment because of her conviction that there would be coaches in heaven (cf. Cotarelo, *Col. de Entremeses*, I, 210-215).

1075-1076. These lines seem directly inspired by *Casa de locos de amor* (*BAE*, xxiii, 354b): "Los más se acogían al sagrado de la pobreza, que es al vestido de bayeta." This piece is of doubtful parentage, but the extensive use of Quevedo's dicta elsewhere in *Sembrar* (cf. pp. 203-205) makes possible influence noteworthy, especially in a passage again strikingly Quevedesque throughout. *Casa's* title and contents may have also suggested 416-417 and 1613-1616, particularly 1616 (cf. "unos decían más que sentían y otros sentían y no decían palabra"); and the punning use of *caballos de ajedrez* in 536, in equally punning contrast with those mentioned in 563, could be partially reminiscent of its "andaba de casa en casa, como pieza de ajedrez." The "remedio era olvidar" (356a) would correspond loosely to 1617-1620.

1214-1216. The Rome of Castiglione's sonnet has been retained in 1216,



and with still "freer" use of this theme, just before *Sembrar*, in *Los ramilletes de Madrid* (Acad. N., xiii, 493a).

1217-1218. Mr. Fichter's interpretation of *mortal teatro* seems too literal. The allusion is not, I think, to some play, but to the familiar *teatro del mundo* theme (all the world's a stage) found in Shakespeare and Calderón: "nor do I marvel that the death of a great nobleman should eloquently remind us (speak on) how short-lived the part one plays in the spectacle of human events really is." That Lope has *privados* in mind rather than kings is corroborated by lines on the same subject in another play about friendship, *Amar sin saber a quién* (2324-2329): "¿Quieres saber qué es un muerto? / Mira un príncipe, y verás / que de él no se acuerdan más / que de un roble en un desierto. / Todos al que muere olvidan, / todos al que hereda van." Both here and in *Sembrar* the tone is strikingly topical.

1302. Celia's understanding comment, 1303-1306, would indicate that the figurative *sin passar de la corteza* refers not to the unmentioned "less important gifts" which Felix has made Prudencia, but to the major returns that she has not made him, and might colloquially be translated "without getting under her skin" or, in view of the *sin tocar una mano* in 1593-1594, "without getting to first base." Lope uses a related figure in *Del monte sale*, 113-128: "Tú a casarte vas / y ellos no, porque los más [señores] / suelen comer las mugeres / como dátiles . . . que se comen la corteza / y echan las almas a mal . . . Pues no fies en su amor, / que sólo comer procura / la corteza a tu hermosura / y echarte a mal el honor."

1675-1677. In connection with *alfileres* and a *corazón de cera*, it might be observed that, at a date close to that of *Sembrar*, Don Rodrigo Calderón was suspected of using precisely such *punzones* to win the affection of Felipe III (cf. Monreal, *Cuadros viejos*, pages 400-405).

1844. A finger ring likewise inspires word-play on *jugar la sortija* (without *a*) in *El acero de Madrid* (Acad. N., xi, 181a).

1905. Romera-Navarro's definition of *al tope* as "la montura de piedras preciosas de igual tamaño y talla, engarzadas juntas sin bordes, grafilas, ni garras, como en las placas de ciertas condecoraciones" (*El criticón*, I, 389, n. 79) agrees with the unquoted definition of the *Diccionario de Autoridades*, "término de plateros con que se significa el modo de estar una cosa junta o pegada con otra sin unión artificial," and seems adequately supported by various texts. Except when figuratively applied to a person, as in *Sembrar*, the term is normally used with its noun in the plural (note, on the contrary, the singular *valax* and *esmeralda* in *Criticón*). This mounting, our channel-setting, could be used for ear pendants as well as for rings, and the very number of its stones would provide the brilliant effects that attracted metaphor. An uncited illustration in the *Autoridades*, "No diamantes al tope vivos, rocas sí continuas . . ." provides an essential that is vividly confirmed by a passage describing a vision of Christ in Luis Vélez de Guevara's *El Príncipe Escanderbey*: "Los blancos dientes al tope / eran diamantes menudos." Mr. Fichter takes the distinguishing feature

to be a somewhat pointed or elongated shape—not the mounting—, but, for play on figurative meanings, the decisive *Criticón* passage (II, 98; cf. n. 81) literally contrasts *al tope cuando conviene* (occasionally set flush against others) with *aun haciendo punta* (even by itself, as a pointed solitaire) as distinctly different. In the *Epistolario* passage, where *ligarón* is a key word, the *diamantes al tope* is used, untranslatably, to mean that Sessa could have had a whole string of women, “one right after another,” for the cost of Jacinta alone. The use of *al tope* with a singular *diamante* sometimes embodies also an unregistered meaning of “in opposition to, vying with.” In *El águila del agua*, for instance, Vélez describes Don Lope as “competidor del sol / bañado en fuego español, / diamante con Marte al tope” (ed. Paz y Melia, III, 312a; cf. also 63b), and in *El Príncipe Escanderbey, a bárbaro etiope* as “diamante negro con el cielo al tope, / que porque al sol empache, / tan Olimpo parece de azabache / que puede con el cielo / levantarse a mayores Mongibelo.” It is this unregistered figurative extension that invites multiple word-play both in the *Criticón* passage and here in *Sembrar*. One is again confronted with a highly Quevedesque way of looking at things (again, cf. *La Estrella de Sevilla*). Elena is associated with Helen of Troy, as in 2527 and 2884–2886, and her name carries a connotation of siege and conflict, akin to the proverbial *resistencia* of diamonds (cf. 2615–2616). With his complicating reprise of the pun on *tope* in 1894–1895 (“like your mistress, you’re a fine-cut jewel to run up against”), the brazen Galindo seems also to be insinuating to Elena that, though he is not a Greek (traditionally wily), she is a jewel that he would like to get his hands on, a hard little piece that he would like to pit his wits against.

2400. In analogy to *doñana*, Lope always writes *donangela* for Doña Angela in his autograph acts of *De cuando acá nos vino* (cf. Acad. N., XI, 671b).

2431. *¡San Blas!* as an expression of astonishment—its use in fright is not clearly established by the passages cited—might well be translated “I’m speechless, I’m simply dumbfounded!” To the conventionally loquacious *gracioso* the lack of words would be a major calamity, and so warrant his frequent invocation of the patron saint “contra el mal de la garganta.”

2561–2562. Note 39 in the Pinelo *Anales* (page 178) speaks of the “fuentes del . . . Prado de San Jerónimo y los dos arcos que en él están de ladrillo.” One of these brick arches must have been that of the Duque.

With a special set of footnotes laudably separating variants from data descriptive of the original manuscript, the text proper, illustrated by four facsimile pages, is scrupulously clean. However, it would, I think, be improved at 687–688, as Mr. Fichter now agrees, by giving these lines back to Inés. They are addressed not to Prudencia, already off-stage, but to Lisardo, and are set in the same picaresquely ironical formality that regularly induces *criadas* and *graciosos* to employ the third person in their first speeches to each other (cf. 1562; Acad. N., IX, 181b; X, 599b; XI, 675a). I should likewise prefer to assign 689–690 to Lisardo, who thereby answers Inés’ question. That the speech-heading *Lisardo* falls two lines below its proper place would be explained by

the probable frequency with which Lope may have inserted a caption only after its corresponding speech had already been written (cf. footnote 1538, his complete omission of speech headings at 1910 and 2799, and his confusion of Inés with Elena, footnotes 851+ and 1557). Slips analogous to the superfluous repetition of *Inés* (689), which Lope forgot to correct, occur at 285 and 2793 and, properly deleted, at 1401. When altering the text proper Lope forgets to cross out something only once, but with his captions, here as in other *comedias*, he is more careless. He sometimes does not bother about stage directions either (cf. 275, 586+). They should be supplied for Felino's exit at 494 and his re-entrance at 525, Florencio's exit at 536, Elena's entrance at 1902 (1894-1901 are addressed to Celia), Galindo's entrance at 2265 (rather than at 2184+), and Elena's entrance at 2832.

Typographical errors and other slips have been kept reasonably close to the apparently inevitable minimum. Read page 34, 2353-2566 for "2352 . . ."; 39, 10, *Valduiueso* for "Valduiueso"; 39, 12, 2 after *Escuela*; line 34, semicolon for comma; 161, 445, with strophic indentation; 603, comma after *manos*; 696, 1178, without asterisk; 714, *Lisardo* as caption; 730, comma for period; 731, *que* for "Que"; 1461, period for comma; 1772, comma for semicolon; 1774, comma for period; 1775, *y* for "Y"; 1785, without comma; 1842, *mi* for "mi"; 2198, question-mark for comma; 2199, *Ni* for "ni"; 2200, period for question-mark; 2227, comma after *sobre*, not *rico* ("superfluously rich"); 2331-2332, without period, *menos* for "Menos" ("My credit will be a bit less than amazing"); 2366, without comma; 2405, comma for period; 2604, 2646, 2685, without commas; 2720-2721, commas for semicolon and after *fee*; 2739-2742, period after *deseo*, *¿Qué . . . qué* for "que . . . que," question-mark for period; 2810, *Florencio* as caption; notes 1421-1428 and 1523-1534, 1396 for "1400"; 2057-2058, line 11, without period after *A*; 2546, 11, *lacayífero* for "alcayífero"; 2555-2562, comma after *Amar*, not period; in Index, under "Stage directions," also 192; under "bayeta," 212.

C. E. ANIBAL

Ohio State University

*The Romance of Daude de Pradas called Dels Auzels Casadors*. Edited with Introduction, Summary, Notes, and Glossary by Alexander Herman Schutz. (Contributions in Languages and Literature, No. 11, Romance Language Series, The Ohio State University, Columbus.) Columbus, 1945. Pp. xi+225.

Daude de Pradas says in the epilogue of this treatise on falconry (lines 3735-3736):

Segon so c'avia promes,  
mos romans del tot complitz es.

These words are also true of the scholar, who, 700 years later, gave us the first critical edition of Daude's work. The publication under review accomplishes

indeed a kind of promise Professor Schutz made, twelve years ago, in his edition of Daude's lyric poems. The task he undertook was an arduous one. Not only did it require all the skill of an experienced philologist but, to an unusual extent, the knowledge of things with which philologists are not generally expected to be familiar: animal physiology, ornithology, botany and veterinary science, or rather what the middle ages considered to be such, which made the task still harder. Professor Schutz surrounded himself with a staff of experts in those fields, besides consulting a vast literature on falconry, both medieval and modern.

His efforts have not been wasted. He has reached his goal, viz. to provide us with what the French call a *texte lisible* (page 18), and Daude's text was worth the toil. Very lively in its first part, a little more monotonous in the second which deals with no end of remedies, it is a monument interesting from the philological viewpoint inasmuch as it offers words, phrases, and constructions found rarely or not at all elsewhere. It is remarkable for dealing with a prominent feature of medieval civilization, and for the skill and even grace with which its author molded his prosaic matter into the then usual poetical form of octosyllabic rhymed couplets. Many of its chapters make pleasant reading, one of the most agreeable being that which deals with the qualifications of a falconer (xxiv). Though probably not quite original (see the editor's note to line 457, page 209), it contains some passages which I would like to mention here as specimens of Daude's art. To emphasize how unfit the warrior is for the job of keeping falcons—hunting was considered, in the middle ages, as a peaceful occupation keeping the knight away from fighting, his real vocation (see page 4)—Daude uses this concise and rather impressive slogan: *C'auzels ab escut non cove* (line 518). No better is the lover in this respect (lines 525 ff.):

E qui trop en dona s'enten  
un jorn en pauc d'ora despen,  
car s'ap sa don'estai un an,  
a lui non seria semblan  
que'i agues neis un jorn estat.

Here, one of life's little ironies, Daude the troubadour loving ladies taught Daude the lover of falcons, and one could imagine the author writing down these lines with his tongue in his cheek.

While Professor Schutz does not say much of the *literary value* of his text, he does not fail to stress the *social importance* of its topic in the middle ages. He illustrates this point with a number of quotations from poets, chiefly Provençal and English, who had allowed themselves to be inspired by the features of this feudal sport (pages 3–6). I would have liked to see him mention that episode from *Jaufre* (ed. Breuer lines 8879 ff.) where the hero watches the villainous Fellon hunting with a magnificent *astor* and, after conquering his powerful adversary, asks for no other reward from the lady whom he has rescued than that admirable bird, not for himself in fact but to give it as a present to King

Arthur.<sup>1</sup> It is worth mentioning that the description which the author of *Jaufre* gives of that marvelous falcon contains the essential features explained by Daude in the first part of his treatise on the hunting birds.

As to the title of this work, Professor Schutz blames modern manuals for calling it *Romans dels Auzels Cassadors* (page 9). First, medieval writings generally do not bear titles at all. Then, a work referred to as *romans*<sup>2</sup> does not mean anything but "that it was written in the vernacular," as the editor points out himself (page 8). And does not the very Daude call his work a *romans* in the lines quoted in the beginning of this review? So I cannot see much harm in giving Daude's treatise the above title, the less so as Barbieri, too, quotes it twice as *Romans dels Auzels cassadors* (see page 14).

We do not know whether Barbieri formed this title by himself or whether he found it in the manuscript he used. The second eventuality would imply that his was different from the four *manuscripts* that are still extant: Rome (*b*), Vich (*v*), Paris (*n*), and—fragmentary—Sutri (*s*<sup>u</sup>). The editor gives a minute description of all of them, of the first three even one page each in facsimile (pages 10–13). A comparison of these manuscripts concerning their value for establishing the text leads him to the conclusion that MS *b* has to form the basis of a critical edition (pages 14–16). That does, of course, not mean that it is perfect. In a number of cases, the editor saw himself induced to abandon the reading of the basic manuscript in favor of those of the others. It even seems to me that he should have done so more often, while, on the other hand, in some cases where *b* was neglected it offers a satisfactory text.

One of the reasons for emending the readings of the base MS is the *versification* (page 18). The editor is right in saying that "Daude was a technician and the text must show an exact syllable count." Professor Schutz is less strict with respect to the rhymes. "What lapses there are," he says, "seem unimportant, being simply hesitations in the quality of *e*" (page 22). I think that, from the standpoint of a careful medieval poet, this was a case of considerable negligence. At any rate, the fact is there that Daude did sin in this respect. However, to judge from the three examples Professor Schutz gives, Daude's fault would indeed not have been very great. For *cuilleretz:etz* (2363–2364) and *vesta:genesta* (3415–3416) are flawless rhymes, and the case of *lebra:desebra* (1527–

1. This incident, which reveals a deep affection for an individual bird, an attitude to which Daude is no stranger either (see ll. 1009–1016 and Schutz, p. 4), and at the same time a readiness to sacrifice the object of that affection to the love of another human being, may appear as a kind of anticipation of Boccaccio's tale, the ninth of the fifth day of the Decameron, about a poor nobleman who sacrifices the last precious thing he owns, his falcon, cooking it to entertain his beloved lady. This tale, again, had a sort of literary revival in the Germany of the second half of the nineteenth century. The poet and novelist Paul Heyse, who started as a scholar in Romance languages and discovered the Old Provençal Alexander fragment, put up this novelette as the model of its genre, and Heyse's theory was known under the name of falcon theory (see my article in *Archiv f. d. St. der neueren Sprachen*, xxvii [1911], 100).

2. This is the form in which the word should be given, not *roman* (p. 9), the *s* being invariably attached to it.

1528) could at least seem dubious, because *lebra*, as a medical expression, might not have been popular in its development (cf. French *lèpre*).

There are, however, though not named by the editor, more cases of irregular rhymes in *-e* in Daude's poem. They are *rauzeitz:metetz* (3319-3320), *trazetz:daretz* (2865-2866), *eirese:el* (2281-2282). But these, too, are not irremediable; in two cases other verbal forms offered by the non-basic manuscripts could—and should—be substituted for the faulty ones, and in the case of *eirese:el* another interpretation of the text will prove helpful.

Where Daude really seems to have sinned is in rhymes in *-o*. We find *gròs: bps* (37-38) and *brò:bp* (3271-3272).<sup>3</sup> One of the most puzzling rhymes is *roven* (MS *roen*):*removen* (3197-3198), the first of these words being likely to belong to *roire* (<*rodere*), the second to *remover* which has *o*, in syllables where this vowel is stressed. Finally the rhyme *corron:s'aturon* (3113-3114) needs an explanation, which will have to be phonetical, and the rhyme *noiritz:sentitz*, apparently so correct, is less so considering that, according to the interpretation Professor Schutz seems to give those two lines, *noiritz* should be *noiretz* and *sentitz* should be *sentis*.

Two more chapters, concerning Daude's sources and previous editions, complete the Introduction. Professor Schutz holds that, in the present stage of our knowledge, it is impossible to make a thorough investigation of the *sources*. So he discusses only some special problems, such as that of possible relations between Daude's work and that of the Emperor Frederick II, both treatises having been written about the middle of the 13th century. He is rather doubtful on this point and gives plausible reasons for his opinion (pages 19-21).

His, of course, is not the first edition. A critical survey (pages 16-19) shows what had been done before him. Since Raynouard, who published a series of fragments in his *Choir* (about 300 lines out of almost 3800), various attempts had been made at making the work known in its entirety. All of them were based on MS *b*, whose complete text Monaci offered in *Studj di fil. romanza*, III. It is Professor Schutz's great merit to have availed himself of the very important Vich manuscript and thus to make possible the establishment of a critical text.

The text itself is preceded by a summary and followed by notes as well as a glossary. The *Résumé* with its style of telegraphic brevity forms a certain contrast to the easy-flowing lines of the thirteenth-century poet. It is the result of a compromise between a full-length translation and none at all (page 8). The question of translations of Provençal texts has often been discussed. In the present reviewer's opinion, nothing can replace a good translation. Not serving artistic purposes, it has by no means to be a poetical one (see page 8). It should

3. The rhyme *ronhps:qs* (1767-1768) will prove all right when the lines are differently explained (see the discussion at the end of this review under *b*). *Dernot:cogot* (189-190) would be wrong, if the nature of the two as indicated in Levy's *Pet. Dict.* is right. But nothing definite can be said before the etymology of *dernot* has been established with certainty. Likewise a judgment on *testor:or* (269-270) has to be postponed because for the first of these words we do not know either its origin or its exact meaning.



follow the text as closely as the spirit of the language into which it is translated permits. This is the only means of making sure that the reader understands the text as the editor wants it to be understood. Through the few cases of real translation which Professor Schutz inserts in his résumé, he has sufficiently proved that nobody would have been better able than he to provide us with a translation combining scholarly exactness with an exquisite style, qualities which make his introduction so agreeable reading. It was an excellent idea of Professor Schutz's to illustrate the translation of Section V with a diagram of wing feathers.

One of Professor Schutz's reasons for rejecting the idea of a prose translation is that it would not justify its high cost (page 8). This argument outweighs any other, especially in a time of war restrictions. Notes and vocabulary seem to have undergone the same economic strain. The *notes* generally give parallels from other medieval works on falconry and explanations of zoological and botanical expressions. Extremely welcome as they are to every philologist not versed in those fields—he might even find that a still greater number of them would not have been superfluous—the reader may occasionally miss an ampler discussion of linguistic phenomena, of which Daude's text offers, as was mentioned before, some rather interesting examples.

What has been said of the translation and the notes is, *mutatis mutandis*, also true for the *vocabulary*. The ideal would have been a complete list of words with an indication of their occurrences in the text, such as we find them in the editions of Bertran de Born (Stimming), Bernart de Ventadorn (Appel), Folquet de Marselha (Stroński), Giraut de Bornelh (Kolsen). Such a complete word-list is not only essential for the right interpretation of the individual text, it is extremely helpful for the study of other texts and lexicography in general. The latter viewpoint is of great importance, considering that the rich additional materials collected by the author of the *Prov. Supplementwoerterbuch* and his successor Appel are not likely to come to light soon, if ever.

As things are, we have to put up with the selection made by Professor Schutz according to principles explained on page 19.<sup>4</sup> One of the principles that

4. Some remarks concerning the glossary. Why *alapens* with -s, the text showing *alapen* in l. 1995? The word-form *aristolochia* (2000) is neither in the text nor in the *varia lectio*. *Atarell* (188), text: *aterel*. *Aulanha* (1357); text *aulana* (: *senmana*) also in l. 2782. The infinitive *fazer* (given s.v. *cal*) is no Provençal form. *Cavilladura* (1270); definition "imping (with a needle)" doubtful. *Cavillar*, corr. *cavilla*. *Coreillar* (1080) is not active, but neuter (*no'ill coreill*). *Cornuda* and *cornilla* should change their places. *Cosi* "cutting (of plant)" is more than doubtful (see remark a at the end of this review). *Cug* "failure" (1072) has nothing to do with *coire*. As *dueit* "apt" (614) is named, *dug* "informed" (2535) should be so, too. *Eisaurar* (1075) is reflexive. *Estan* (2140) "exhausted." I do not believe that such a word existed; at any rate it should have been marked as very doubtful. *Escentaill* (3445) "fan-tail(?)"; it is to be kept in mind that *eventail* is a 16th-century word. *Fetz* "small piece (of dung?)" (1168) is extremely questionable. *Folrar* "to wrap up" (1210) occurs with the sense of "to line" in l. 551. *Gorga* "crop" (1104) is found as "contents of the crop" in ll. 2383, 2841. *Groguezir* (2671) is not "to grow yellow," but "to make yellow." *Longuet* (2902) cannot possibly be a noun meaning "long piece." There is no necessity at all to adopt the definition "to masturbate" for *mantuzar* (477). *Mousar* "to milk" (605) does not exist; the form *mous* is third pers. perf. of *molzer* < *mulgere*. *Polsius*, corr. *polsiu* (2547). *Pudit* (3475) corr. *pudit* (< -iciu). *Romet* (1951), corr. *rometz* (see note p. 211). *Suc* "juice" (*passim*)



guided him was to incorporate in his glossary "words used in an unusual sense or vaguely defined in the current dictionaries." In some cases, Professor Schutz has even narrowed the circle of words which he admitted to his vocabulary. Here are a few of the expressions which we should have expected to find in it. The word *cais* repeatedly has the sense of "somewhat, a little, rather," which the editor seems to confirm by rendering, in the *Résumé* (page 25), *hueills cais escurs* (line 49) by "darkish eyes." *Far joc ab* (line 61) "to enjoy something" corroborates the only extant evidence of this phrase (*far joc de*; Levy, *Prov. Suppl. Wb.*, IV, 258). For *estranh*, at least in two passages (lines 369 and 3156), none of the definitions hitherto established is satisfactory. The word *bailia* (line 370) has no doubt the meaning of "sort, kind" (cf. Old French *baillie*) not yet listed in the dictionaries. The definition "to cast (a falcon)" for *laisar* (line 805) is likewise missing.

With these statements we have already penetrated into the domain of *textual criticism*. I am sure Professor Schutz is the last to pretend that his text does not need any corrections. No first critical edition of a Provençal text can claim to be perfect, particularly not a text offering so many difficulties as this one. We readily believe Professor Schutz when he says that "the road proved sufficiently rocky" (page vii). Once the way is paved, it is comparatively easy for others to straighten out some of the unevennesses that may have remained here and there. With this fact in mind, I should like to submit to those who will study this text a number of corrections that would seem to be necessary. I am afraid, though, that I have already abused the reader's patience and considerably exceeded the space generally allotted to reviewers. So I make a selection of only five out of the remarks which I had in mind. They concern a) semasiology, b) versification, c) use of the *varia lectio*, d) general construction of a sentence, e) emending manuscripts.

a) Lines 824-826. Daude wishes the falcon-keeper to see to it that the bird is kept in a place of moderate temperature and to scatter mint and catnip over the floor where the bird lies down:

E que giete petits cosis  
de manta o de nepta lai  
on l'auzels sejorna e jai.

What is *cosis*? The *Résumé* (page 30) says: "bits." The glossary has *cosi* "cutting (of plant)." The note to line 820 calls the word a mystery, connects it with *cos* "vase de bois," *cosso* "sébile, gourde" and *cossete* "calice," and points to the *n* variant *romeitz*.<sup>5</sup> The definitions given here do not have much in common nor do either they or the word *romeitz* explain *cosis*. I think the word less mysterious than it is supposed to be. I see in it the well-known word *coisi* "cushion." The diphthongs composed of vowel + *i* have a tendency to lose

and *sue* "top of the head" (2278) are different words. *Vesc* "bird-lime" is right for l. 308; it is "mistle" in l. 2188 (not mentioned in the vocabulary).

5. This could only be *rometz* "bramble," which occurs also in l. 1951. But the *varia lectio* shows *rameitz*, which would be *rametz* "twigs." Neither word fits the rhyme, which requires a word in *-is*.

their second element (cf. Appel, *Prov. Lautlehre*, §34<sup>6</sup>), and French *coussin* also shows two forms in Old French: *coisin* and *cousin*. Thus Daude recommends to put little cushions made of mint or catnip on the floor of the *ferma* for the bird to rest and relax on them.

b) Lines 1766–1768. Daude warns of the danger which the bird is exposed to when its beak is getting too big, because this causes diseases. For the bird living wild that danger does not exist, because, in the natural state, it eats bony meat and after eating, polishes its beak on a stone or a rough piece of wood:

Cant a manjat, el lo forbis  
a peira o a fust ronhos  
et enaissi adoba l'os.

The Résumé does not take care of the last of these lines. But as the text runs, *l'os* can only be meant to be "the bone." This interpretation cannot be correct, for two reasons. The beak does not consist, at least not in its visible part, of bone, which therefore does not undergo any influence through polishing, and the word *os* with *o* should not rhyme with *ronhos* having *o*. Daude, it is true, as shown above, is not always very careful concerning the nature of the *o* in words he couples by the rhyme. But we should not impute to him more cases of negligence than is absolutely necessary. And this is not one of them, because it can be eliminated by reading *lo's* for *l'os*. Then the last line means: "and in this way the bird keeps it (*lo=lo bec*) in order for itself (*'s=se*, dativus ethicus)." Daude—and not he alone—rhymes enclitic pronouns with tonic elements. Professor Schutz gives some examples of this (page 22), but only for *ne* (*=en<inde*). Instances of *la*, *o*, and *lo* are no less frequent in Daude's work: *manje la:la ma* (lines 715–716), *dirai vos o:sazo* (lines 507–508), *paizetz lo:rato* (lines 2841–2842), *preizo:giquetz lo* (lines 983–984). The examples with *lo* show that the *o* of *lo* is closed, as it is expected to be according to its origin, and the rhyme *ronhos:lo's* is perfect.

c) Lines 623–626. According to Daude, the *ferma*, i.e. the nest or cage of the young falcon, should be half in shade, half in sunlight for the bird to choose whichever he likes better:

Mas la ferma, per mon conseil,  
meja'n ombra, meja'n<sup>7</sup> soleill  
estia; pueis, can si volra,  
ombra o soleill cauzira.

The word *mon* in line 623 is a correction suggested by E. Levy (*Litbl. f. germ. und rom. Phil.*, xi, 343). The base MS *b* has *mi*, and this might and should have been kept. Then *conseill* is not the noun "advice," but the first person of the

6. Appel, it is true, only gives examples for diphthongs in stressed syllables; but his *Prov. Chrestomathie* shows *noirit* for *noirit* (123, 56), and the unstressed conjunctions *pos* and *mas* contrast with the stressed adverbs *pois* (*pueis*) and *mais* of same origin.

7. The text has *meja'n*. The dot should be applied to cases of enclisis only. A preposition (here *en*) is proclitic rather than enclitic, and *en* lost its initial vowel here through aphesis after the *a* of *meja*. This should be indicated by an apostrophe.

present tense of *conseillar* "to advise," and *per mi conseil* means: "I give this advice on the ground of my own experience." The phrase *per*+personal pronoun with the sense of *from one's own experience* has not yet been listed by the lexicographers, although it is fairly frequent in Old Provençal. Bernart de Ventadorn says (*Gr.*, 70, 12 ed. Appel, p. 68; v, 6): *Qu'enuyos es preyar, pos er perdutoz*; *Per me'us o dic, que mals m'en es vengutz*. Strangely enough, in his vocabulary Appel mentions this passage under *per* "fuer, an Stelle von," but the translation correctly says: "Aus Erfahrung rede ich." *De nien se cuja fenher Cel que vol amor persegre*; *Per mi'l dic . . .*, Elias Cairel, *Gr.*, 133, 4; iv, 3 (ed. Jaeschke, p. 109). Schultz-Gora, in his review of Miss Jaeschke's edition (*ZRP*, XLIV, 359) renders *per mi* by "aus eigener Erfahrung." Doussa res, *que qu'om vos dia, No cre que tals dolors sia Cum qui part amic d'amia, Qu'ieu per me mezeys o sai*, Bertran d'Alamanon (?), *Gr.*, 76, 23 (ed. Audiau, *Nouvelle Anthologie* No. LXI), III, 4. Translation: "par ma propre expérience." *E non o sai per mos veisins, Antz o sai planamentz per me*, "Jaufre" (ed. Breuer), line 6521. *Ab gran joi mou maintas vetz e commenssa So don hom puous a dolor e cossire. Per mi'us o dic . . .*, Peirol, *Gr.*, 366, 1 (ed. Appel, *Bern. de Vent.*, page 341), I, 3. *Per que lo cor manten mout miels* [sc. "than the eyes"] *joven, Qe ve de loing, e l'oill pres solamen*. *Per mi'us o dic, que lieis<sup>8</sup> que'm ten gauzen Am ab fin cor, loing e pres, on que sia*, Guir. de Salignac-Peironet, *Gr.*, 249, 2 (ed. Strempele,<sup>9</sup> page 43), III, 7.

d) The small section LII, comprising only the six following lines (1209-1214), deals with a means to protect the falcon from cold feet:

Si voletz far vostr'auzel gardar  
de freit als pes, senes folrar,  
de pel la perga on estai  
de fust mol, aisi com dirai  
li faitz sa perga en ivern;  
e non o tengatz az esquern.

The Résumé (page 33) renders this as follows: "To keep your bird's feet warm without wrapping them, cover the perch with fur in winter. And don't think this is a joke." I doubt that Daude wanted to say that. The conditional clause beginning with *Si* (line 1209) does not end with *folrar* (line 1210) but goes as far as *estai* (line 1211), the main clause being *de fust mol, aisi com dirai, li faitz sa perga en ivern*. Accordingly this is what I think to be the right translation: "If you want to protect your bird's feet from the cold without covering the perch on which it stays with fur, make, as I shall tell you, its perch out of soft wood in winter." This measure could indeed seem strange to many people, who might think that the author is mocking at them. Daude's remark *aisi com dirai* seems completely superfluous in the interpretation represented by the Résumé. As a matter of fact, it is not at all. Just as he announces it, Daude later on comes back to his advice (lines 1703-1705):

8. With MS A, against the text, which has *cel*.

9. Strempele's translation "was mich betrifft" is not correct.

Una perga bella e plana  
de fust mol, car sel'es plus sana,  
li faitz metre.

e) Line 392. The falcon called *surpunic* has hardly ever been seen by man, so Daude does not want to speak very much about it: *per so m'en passarai de cist*. The emendation of a manuscript should be done only if it is necessary and its result evident. This seems to be true of the sentence just quoted. Its last word is definitely wrong, *cist* being a nominative. The correct form would be *cest*, and MS *n* indeed has *d'aquest*. Both *cest* and *aquest* would destroy the rhyme, which requires a word in *-ist*. There can hardly be any doubt that *cist* is a misreading for *tist* "haste."<sup>10</sup> It even seems that *tist* had been the original reading of MS *b*. Daude uses the same phrase in line 1141: *de molt gran tist*.<sup>11</sup> It is significant that here MS *n* also reads *sist*; apparently the scribes were not quite familiar with the word *tist*. So, in line 392, MS *b* corrected *tist* to *cist*, thus introducing a heavy grammatical mistake, of which we hesitate very much to think that Daude could have been guilty. MS *n* avoided it by reading *d'aquest*, which does not fit the rhyme, and MS *v* has *deusist*, which looks as if it were to be connected with the verb *dever*; but it is inadmissible both from the standpoint of morphology and sense. So the substitution of *sist* (*cist*) for *tist* seems to go back to a source common to all the manuscripts. We translate line 392 as follows: "Therefore I shall have done with it quickly." In this translation, the words "with it" render the pronominal adverb *en*. Beside this *en*, a phrase consisting of *de* and a demonstrative pronoun would be nothing but a duplication, another argument in favor of *tist*.

The foregoing remarks sufficiently show that the present reviewer's approach to the edition of Daude's book was—and had to be—almost exclusively philological. I hope they have shown, too, how interesting the troubadour's treatise is from this point of view, not to speak of its factual importance, and how grateful we have to be to Professor Schutz for having made the text so easily accessible to both Provençalists and the students of medieval civilization.

KURT LEWENT

New York City

*Literary Portraiture in the Historical Narrative of the French Renaissance.* By Blanchard W. Bates. New York, G. E. Stechert and Co., 1945. Pp. vii + 168.

The plan and purpose of this book is perhaps best seen by contrast with that of an earlier work rather similar in title, a German dissertation by Gustav A.

10. Palaeographically speaking, *c* and *t* resemble each other very much, and a misreading of one for the other of the two letters could and did occur rather easily.

11. All this had already been pointed out long ago by E. Levy in *Litbl. f. germ. und rom. Phil.*, xi (1890), 343.

Jekel.<sup>1</sup> Jekel studied portrayal principally from the historian's point of view and limited himself to historians and memoir-writers. Dr. Bates examines the portrait proper as a *genre* which the 16th century prepared for its flowering in the 17th; he selects historical narrative as a branch of literature fertile in such portraiture; and he broadens the field of his study so as to include Montaigne and the travel writers as well as the historians.

This broad definition of the subject seems open to criticism in view of the title. Despite Dr. Bates's explanations (pages 8-9), it is hard to accept Montaigne's *Essais* as "historical narrative." Their inclusion suggests that the subject is almost that of all appropriate non-fiction; and in this connection, the choice of a field would have been clearer, and the book as a whole richer, if the author had shown to what extent the portraiture he treats is typical of 16th-century portraiture in general. Dr. Bates's reason for including Montaigne is that he is in part an autobiographer, and as such akin to the memoir-writers who more clearly belong under his title. Yet though he discusses the possible influence of the memoir-writers on the *Essais* (pages 78-80), he leaves the matter without indicating any real evidence of this. Any positive evidence would be not only a welcome addition to our understanding of Montaigne, but also a justification for his presence in this work.

Montaigne is not only present, he is the climax of the book. Unfortunately the chapter on him is followed by two others besides the conclusion.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the first five chapters the movement is excellent; the reader follows the author with growing interest as he advances through the background and the minor figures to his two principals, Brantôme and Montaigne. But after these two—and despite a sound transition—Chapter vi is a comedown with its travelers of little literary importance (Belon, Postel, Villamont, Léry); they are mostly earlier in time than the previous authors, and their descriptions of people, as Dr. Bates admits, are mostly rather superficial sketches. Then follows a chapter on portraiture and contemporary taste that is almost necessarily static and seems to belong rather to the introductory part. Nor is the anticlimax merely in the reader's interest; for Montaigne and Brantôme are not only the ablest exponents of their own time but also the two who most clearly anticipate and influence the century that follows.

A final criticism is that there are too many errors of transcription.<sup>3</sup> None of these appear to be important, and indeed nearly all are very trivial; but they

1. *Die Schilderung des Menschen bei den französischen Geschichtsschreibern der Renaissance*, Wertheim am Main, Bechstein, 1929.

2. The chapters are as follows: i. Introduction; ii. The Literary Portrait and History; iii. Memoirs and Biography; iv. Brantôme, the Social Columnist; v. Man to Man: Montaigne; vi. Literary Portraiture and Exotic Travels; vii. Literary Portraiture and Contemporary Tastes; viii. Conclusion.

3. In the two longest chapters, on Brantôme and Montaigne, there are over fifty small errors. It would be idle to list them all; but on page 62, for example, we read "esté près" instead of "esté, près" (l. 19); "transparens" instead of "transparans" (l. 25); "accompagné" instead of "accompagnée" (l. 29); "prend" instead of "prendra" (l. 29); "renommée" instead of "rénommée" (l. 33).

weaken the reader's confidence in the author, a confidence which otherwise he fully deserves.

For the foremost quality of Dr. Bates's book is its solidity and trustworthiness. His judgments of detail are based on sound textual evidence of which he offers the reader enough to form his own opinions, and his conclusions are firmly grounded on these judgments. At the same time, he never swamps the reader with his documentation; nor does his respect for evidence keep him from offering the broader views that are less demonstrable but that give a book richness and scope.

Dr. Bates sketches clearly and surely the history of the classical and medieval literary portrait, the background, and the lesser Renaissance exponents of the *genre*. He shows the factors in its development: the Italian influence; the growing secularization of interests; the study, imitation, and assimilation of the ancient models; the increasing interest in psychological study; these and the other advances by which Montaigne and the 17th century are to profit.

The chapters on Brantôme and Montaigne are the most interesting. Brantôme's abilities are well analyzed and illustrated in a close study of seven of his best portraits. The fact that five of these are of women is no accident; for as Dr. Bates shows, the importance of deeds tends to make the portraits of men almost straight narrative, while in studying the women Brantôme seeks primarily to reveal and explain their charm in a regular portrait. Brantôme's vividness, his ability to re-create his characters, is well brought out; and if his digressions and lack of composition do not appear, it is because Dr. Bates rightly sticks to his purpose of showing primarily the best work that his period produced.

The chapter on Montaigne is well done, especially in view of the embarrassment of riches that confronted the author. Keeping the limits of his subject always in mind, Dr. Bates has wisely avoided what must have been innumerable temptations to digress, and confined his detailed treatment to the individual portraits of others and the self-portrait in the essay *De la praesumption* (II, 17). This piece is chosen rather than other autobiographical passages because, written as it is in the early days of Montaigne's *étude du moi* (about 1579), it is less concerned with mankind in general as seen in himself than with himself alone, and is thus less the medium of a moralist and more a portrait proper. Although this difference is only one of degree, it may be significant. In *De la praesumption* Montaigne's general purpose is already clearly in his mind: it is here that he speaks of "l'estude que je fay, duquel le subject c'est l'homme." Perhaps he is inaugurating his full-scale study of man in this way; laying his cards on the table, as it were, showing the reader his credentials: the ordinariness that makes him a fit specimen to study, the common sense (he hopes) and the inward bent that should qualify him as a student.

But this sort of digressive speculation is one of the dangers that Dr. Bates has done so well to avoid. It merely shows a quality of his book that springs from the thoroughness of his treatment. Though he has not strayed from his



subject, neither has he neglected its implications. The result is a study that is not only conscientious and sound but also thoughtful and suggestive.

DONALD M. FRAME

Columbia University

*Baudelaire: A Criticism.* By Joseph D. Bennett. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1944. Pp. 165.

This is a dangerous book. Although Mr. Bennett writes with sincerity and sensitivity, his approach impedes his critical judgment. He is more concerned, basically, with Baudelaire the penitent child of God than with Baudelaire the artist, yet he professes to analyze the text of certain poems for their esthetic merit. Paradoxically, one will be stimulated by some of the literary elucidations and will discard the irritating, partial, and unnecessary atmosphere of religious fervor. The parts that are good are good *in spite of* the author's real intent.

After a brief sketch of Baudelaire's life and a castigation of his sin, dandyism, Mr. Bennett establishes for analysis three categories of poems which "approach nearest to perfection": those treating the problem of sin and dealing with the dual nature of man; those dealing with remorse; and those expressing escape through *volupté*. Each category has its characteristic: irony, sympathy, pantheistic pleasure. The plan is neat but unconvincing. Examples overflow from one category into another. An almost complete absence of historical or circumstantial criticism,<sup>1</sup> and a pernicious lack of recognition—not even a single mention—of Baudelaire's avowed architectural construction of *Les Fleurs du Mal* weaken the presentation. The translations do not claim to be anything but literal; they are occasionally incorrect.<sup>2</sup> Passages from the *Journaux intimes* compare favorably with Christopher Isherwood's translation.<sup>3</sup> But Mr. Bennett sometimes takes two texts and runs them together as though they were one.<sup>4</sup>

This brief book has, besides the tautological quotations, and the overwritten passages, numerous vigorous condemnations of the nineteenth century, and fulsome recommendations of Baudelaire to the Almighty's clemency. Here is no adequate interpretation of a vital poet. The author unwittingly criticizes his own position when he writes: "We do not so much enter the cosmos of Baudelaire as we each arrange him into our own cosmos" (pages 30-31).

S. S. WEINER

New York City

1. See Lawrence B. Leighton's excellent "A Doctrinal Baudelaire" [*The Kenyon Review*, vii (Spring, 1945), 321-324].

2. See Harry Levin's very able semantic and historical criticism in "Flowers of Good" (*New Republic*, 18 December 1944, p. 841).

3. Charles Baudelaire, *Intimate Journals*. Translated by Ch. Isherwood. Introduction by T. S. Eliot. New York, Random House, 1930.

4. P. 15: *Mon Cœur mis à nu*, xxxiii (Edition de la Pléiade) and an unidentified appendage; p. 27: *idem*, lxxxvii and an unidentified intercalation; p. 42: *idem*, cxi and xl.



*Sentido y forma de las 'Novelas ejemplares.'* By Joaquín Casaldüero. Buenos Aires, Instituto de Filología, 1943. Pp. 219.

The most immediately striking feature of this book is the hermeticism of its approach. It is possible to turn many pages without seeing the name of another critic, another book, or even a mention of Cervantes himself. We simply have Professor Casaldüero and the twelve *Novelas* lying open on the table before him. This seclusion, this critical tête-à-tête, however, does not result in a series of merely personal evaluations or preferences. Casaldüero is present, but he has objectified himself by a kind of self-identification with the literary theory of the "Baroque" that is the basis of this and several others of his works. This is not pointed out for the purpose of quarreling with the concept of the Baroque, without which an understanding of the artistic life of the Spanish 17th century would be impossible, but because the way Casaldüero employs it constitutes the principal limitation of an excellent study. It is as if he were undertaking to explain the works of Shelley with no other reference than to their Romanticism. Cervantes is mentioned, of course, but he seems to Casaldüero to be more a symbol or representative of the Baroque than the living creator of the *Novelas ejemplares*. And other students of Cervantes, many of whom have differing interpretations, can by this procedure be disregarded since the Baroque for Casaldüero has the efficacy of being a total explanation. Thus, a sort of hermetic communion between "sentido" (the Baroque) and "forma" (the written record of the *Novelas*) is substituted for the more basic three-way esthetic equation of Cervantes, his world, and the meaning the *Novelas* have had for later generations.

In spite of the drawbacks which this method may have, it does possess certain advantages and these Casaldüero exploits to the full. It allows him to travel through the *Novelas* free of the burden of over-erudition (although his knowledge of the Cervantean field is profound) and with his eyes washed clean of past misinterpretations. It is this quality of freshness, of personal witnessing, that makes his analysis of form particularly interesting. In the first place, instead of studying the *Novelas* separately, as has so often been done in the past, Casaldüero has an original vision of them as a whole, a whole possessed of a definite esthetic form and division into parts. He bases this upon the progression of themes which he believes to be as follows: the first four *Novelas* represent the "ideal world" and the last four the "social world" with the two central pairs dealing with the themes of "original sin" and "virtue and liberty." With these ideas in mind, he finds many meaningful repetitions and significant interrelationships among the *Novelas*. For example, he shows how the "Coloquio de los perros" furnishes a symphonic conclusion to the whole by recapitulating and reworking the thematic motifs of the others. His discoveries of hitherto unseen formal relationships within the individual *Novelas* are also illuminating. In the essay on "La fuerza de la sangre" he finds that Cervantes' usual division into four parts has been superimposed upon a

vital division into three which correspond to the successive human stages of sin, confession, and redemption, each of them marked by a fainting spell on the part of the overcome heroine, Leocadia. Moreover, his revelations of form are not limited to theme and narrative progression; he also outlines it for us in the characters, in the settings, and in their mutual artistic relationships. His interpretation of the varying roles of the several paired characters, such as Rinconete and Cortadillo and "Las dos doncellas," as they become modified by thematic and environmental necessities, is an excellent example. It is, in fact, this delicate perception of formal relationships that constitutes Casaldueño's chief effectiveness as a critic. Some of these relationships may be regarded as arbitrary or precious, but all are interesting and many may come to be recognized as necessary to an understanding of the structure of the Cervantean short story. Casaldueño's sensitivity adds meaning to the reading of Cervantes; *Sentido y forma* possesses what is certainly the primary virtue of a book written about a book.

As has already been indicated, it is when Casaldueño leaves the artistry of the *Novelas ejemplares* and attempts to enter into the meaning of their creation, their "sentido," that there is room for disagreement. In the creative forces behind the *Novelas* his mind still perceives the form, the pattern, and the intricate subtle relationships that it perceived in the thing created. The whole of these composite parts Casaldueño calls the "Baroque." This, in itself, would be more of an unfortunate necessity than an error (since historians of literature like biologists are continually faced with the problem of converting life into diagram), if it were not for the fact that Casaldueño pays so little attention to his living model. No longer guided forcibly in his perceptivity by the contents of the printed page and apparently unwilling to submit to the process of deducing the Baroque for us from its representative creators, Casaldueño presents us with a Baroque that is at once absolute and personal, an induced Baroque.

Furthermore, Casaldueño makes little effort to define his terms. He does not try to explain his Baroque, because to him it is self-explanatory. His own readers seem to have as little contributive presence in the book as do other readers of the *Novelas ejemplares*. It is necessary, therefore, to judge Casaldueño's version of Cervantes and of Cervantes' synonym, the Baroque, from isolated quotations. In the essay on "La española inglesa," for example, he speaks of Cervantes' use of contrasting planes of reality as follows: "Una lucha que no exige la destrucción del contrario sino que conduce a la superación de los dos elementos antagónicos y permite formar una unidad." Again, writing about "La ilustre fregona," he says: "En el Barroco los dos elementos antagónicos se sostienen y apoyan el uno al otro. Su convergencia *anega* su individualidad y crea una nueva unidad *tensa* . . ." These two ideas, which seem to be fundamental to the Casaldueño conception of the Baroque, are not necessarily wrong; Casaldueño's perceptivity seldom leads him into error. But, presented inductively, without support from the other writers of the time, they have lost their vital perspectives to such a degree that they become superimposed one

upon the other. "Superación" is far from being the same thing as "anegación." In the difference between the two words lies all the difference between a Cervantes and a Quevedo, a Salas Barbadillo, or even a Calderón. In it lies all the difference between Cervantes and the Baroque. Cervantes, and this is the thing that Casaldueiro has not perceived, was the one man of his time who was able to surpass the false "unidad tensa" of expressionism and achieve both intellectually and vitally a real resolution of the terrible Baroque duality, the separation of man from the universe. That is why he was able not only to write the first true novel but also to endow it with meaning lasting until our own times. Cervantes was not himself Baroque, at least not in the ordinary sense of the word, although his points of esthetic departure and many of his creative tools were often so. He was unique, a man, an example only of himself.

STEPHEN GILMAN

Princeton University

*Vida y obra de Galdós (1843-1920)*. By Joaquín Casaldueiro. Buenos Aires, Editorial Losada, 1943. Pp. 181.

It would be difficult to find in European literature a novelist of greater fecundity than Benito Pérez Galdós. He is an outstanding example of prolific writers, even in a century like the 19th, noted for literary abundance, or in a country like Spain which counts Lope de Vega among the several "monsters" of the written word it has produced. Excluding his dramatic work (21 plays) and his miscellaneous writings (12 volumes), Galdós wrote 75 novels in a total of 86 volumes. And the amplitude of his fictional work is not just a matter of quantity, for in it we find practically all types of novel known to his epoch, from the historical to the psychological and from the purely narrative to the symbolic and the abstract. He fused in his work most of the literary and ideological trends of a period characterized by great resourcefulness in formulating new doctrines, literary as well as social and philosophical. He went from straight realism and then naturalism to almost pure fantasy in some of his last novels such as *El caballero encantado*, and from a positivistic outlook deriving from Comte to a new religious spiritualism not far removed from that of Tolstoy. To all this add the rich substance that he extracted from the Spanish tradition and, especially, his potent creative faculties. As Madariaga has said: "The subject of Galdós' work could be defined thus: human nature as seen by an unprejudiced observer of 19th-century Spain."

To discover and analyze the unity and continuity of a record of this kind was not an easy task and never had been done before with the insight, patience and detail that give an outstanding value to Professor Casaldueiro's book.

Besides the many studies of individual works or particular aspects, we have had some excellent interpretations of Galdós' novelistic creation, such as those by Menéndez y Pelayo, Clarín and Onís, but Casaldueiro goes much farther

than any of the previous critics in following more precisely, almost step by step, the complete evolution of Galdós' total production, his novels as well as his drama.

He has dedicated many years to the study of his subject and read as far as we can judge every word written by Galdós. He has taken into consideration every single novel and play, keeping very closely in his exposition to the chronological order in the production of Galdós. He forgets nothing that is important for the understanding of literary or ideological development. And yet, his is not a book of minute detail or boring erudition. It goes straight to essentials; it is a scholarly study without a single footnote and with only the dates—very few—really necessary for establishing the significant stages in Galdós' literary and spiritual growth. All information is well assimilated and in both senses of the word well screened. Casaldueiro is more interested in the meaning of the literary facts than in the facts themselves.

The book follows a clear pattern. The first chapter, "Vida de Galdós," is not so much a biography in the usual sense of the word as a psychological and moral image of the writer, integrating his life with the life of Spain in his time which forms the ever-present theme of his novels. We observe the external man in the world that he objectively tried to reflect in his work and the internal man in the midst of the conflicts, spiritual as well as social and historical, that breathe in his literary creation.

The rest of the book deals with the writings of Galdós. Analysis and interpretation are combined within a wide plan tending to show the constant evolution of the artist, the novelist, the thinker, and we might say the historian, for the substance and the theme of Galdós' novel and drama was the historical development of modern Spain, seen in the interrelation of man and society, of past and present. This is an interrelation which in Spain more than in any country of modern Europe had a dramatic quality, born of the unsolvable conflict between a deep-rooted religious tradition often degenerating into forms of fanatic intolerance, and modern liberal ideas which for lack of a suitable social and economic climate often became a motive of unbridled political emotions in the soul of a passionate people. The conflict was not only political and social—it was a living conflict within the nature of every Spaniard. Thus Spain for the last one hundred and fifty years has lived in a constant commotion, oscillating between moments of a violent turmoil and others of complete marasmus, the Spanish sleepiness of which Waldo Frank spoke, that special type of Spanish indifference described by the untranslatable word "desengaño."

To his great credit Galdós has understood better than any of his countrymen this peculiar character of the modern Spanish dilemma. It is described and reflected as a living phenomenon seen from all possible angles in his novels, first in historical development in the 46 volumes of the *Episodios Nacionales*; then as a reflection of ideological and psychological forces in the novels of the first period such as *Doña Perfecta* and *Gloria*; then as a human reality in the lives of hundreds of individuals in the "contemporary novels."

To the vision of the Spanish life of his century—the immediate reality which as a novelist he undertook to study—Galdós brought a mind that was universal in a double sense. He steadily searched for permanent values, especially in his maturity, after transcending the pure realistic credo of his first works. At the same time his mind was constantly opened to all the ideas of his own time, above all to the most pressing ideological problem of his generation, that of the second half of the 19th century: how to integrate the modern immanent and scientific conception of reality with a religious and spiritual conception of life.

In his study of Galdós' work, Casaldueiro has gone to the core in order to find the profound meaning hidden under the circumstantial themes. He has carried through with success a plan that takes account of the total evolution of Galdós' novels. He considers Galdós' vision of the historical problems of Spain as these were reflected in the life and struggle of her people. He also investigates the constant progress of Galdós, parallel to that of 19th-century thought, towards a spiritual outlook, achieved not by rejecting entirely realism, naturalism and positivism as forms of thought, esthetic or otherwise, but by transcending them, by a steady upward movement from one level to the other, from one plane to the next one, higher in the scale of the spirit.

The comprehensiveness of Casaldueiro's plan is evident from even the briefest summary of the book's chapters. Chapter II, "Historia y abstracción," deals with the first two series of the *Episodios*, and the first novels, *Doña Perfecta*, *Gloria*, *Marianela* and *La familia de León Roch*, and has as subdivisions "Período histórico" and "Subperíodo abstracto." Chapter III, "El naturalismo," deals with the Madrilenian novels, from *La desheredada* to *Lo prohibido*. Chapter IV, "La materia y el espíritu," has two subdivisions, (1) "La realidad y el espíritu," about *Fortunata y Jacinta*, *Miau* and *La incógnita*, and (2) "El hombre y el espíritu," an analysis of *Torquemada en la hoguera*, *Realidad*, *Ángel Guerra* and *Tristana*. Chapter V, "El espiritualismo," studies the plays and novels from *La loca de la casa* to *Misericordia*, under the following subdivisions: (1) "Espiritualización de la materia. La materia sin el espíritu," (2) "El teatro," and (3) "La doctrina espiritualista." Chapter VI, "La libertad," is a treatment of the third and fourth series of *Episodios* and the plays written in the same period, between 1898 and 1907. Chapter VII, "Mitología. Extratemporalidad," has two subdivisions: (1) "Período mitológico," (2) "Subperíodo extratemporal," in which are studied the last six volumes of the *Episodios*, the novel *El caballero encantado*, and the last plays, all works of a period in which Galdós is old and almost blind. Now he transcends definitely the reality of life and muses over the many themes of his past work, seeing history, the history of Spain—that had been the stuff of his novels—and the problems of the modern man in an ideal world deprived of the notion of time. Galdós, like "Doña Juana la loca," the heroine of his last and profoundly moving play, *Santa Juana de Castilla*, can remember everything but has liberated himself from the relativity of time in order to seek only the absolute, the liberation of the spirit.

The closing sentences of Casaldueiro's book, referring to *Santa Juana*, define clearly this last moment of Galdós' long search: "Es su último sueño, el sueño con que termina la larga peregrinación emprendida partiendo de la Materia y de la Historia, y que le conduce, después de la busca sincera de la Verdad, al Espíritu, a la Eternidad."

One of the main attainments of Casaldueiro has been to discover and to show all through his study that Galdós himself, while meaning to adhere faithfully to the artistic objectivity which Flaubert recommended, actually lived the spiritual drama—the drama of Spain as well as the drama of searching for a permanent truth—which inspired his novels. He was not the cold and impassive narrator which some of the critics would have us believe. Under the ironical detachment, the almost cruel humor with which he portrays the anguish of a character or a black episode in the turmoil of Spanish politics, revolutions and civil strife, he was "un espíritu turbado e inquieto," as he described his restlessness in a comparison with the firm religious serenity of Pereda.

This idea underlies the whole study and is probably the most original contribution of Casaldueiro to the understanding of the most important Spanish author of the 19th century.

There are many sound remarks about concrete and special points, esthetic as well as historical or ideological. I recommend the lucid explanation of the differences between the European and the Spanish attitudes toward the religious minorities, especially the Jews, in the discussion of *Gloria* (pages 55–57), the interpretation of the problem of reality in *Marianela* (page 60 and *passim*), the comparison between the social struggle and changes in the modern nations of Europe and the political strifes in Spain which develop almost without exception into a struggle for power between military factions (page 135). There are also keen observations on the influence which the new literary style of the next generation, based mainly on symbolism and impressionism, exerted on the older Galdós.

Professor Casaldueiro's book is a capital contribution to the interpretation of Galdós and probably the best book on the subject. I do have one important reservation. The author's method, as well as his outlook on literature, is purely intellectual, one could almost say purely abstract. He gives us therefore a key to the understanding of Galdós' ideas, methods, attitudes, as they developed in a rich and complicated work; but he fails—it was indeed not his purpose—to transmit to the reader the feeling of human values, the wealth of humor and life that abounds in Galdós' pages. The hundreds of living creatures created by Galdós' imagination become pure symbols of an ideological search, pieces in a complicated pattern of ideas. This does not diminish the value of the book, as Casaldueiro conceived it, but it suggests the limits of the interpretation.

ANGEL DEL RÍO

Columbia University



*Contemporary Spanish Poetry. Selection from Ten Poets.* Translated by Eleanor L. Turnbull with Spanish Originals and Personal Reminiscences of the Poets by Pedro Salinas. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Pp. xiii+401.

Miss Turnbull, already known as a translator of Salinas and a good friend of Spanish letters, now offers a fine tribute to the contemporary poets of Spain. In no other work published in an English-speaking country can there be found a more complete or better selection of the rich and valuable poetic achievements of the group which, between 1920 and 1935, represents in Spain the "poesía nueva."

The book has a literary value rather than a historical or critical one. It will appeal mainly to the lover of poetry. But the teacher and the scholar will also have professional reasons for esteeming it. Through the Spanish originals and Miss Turnbull's translations they will become acquainted with a period of Spanish poetry of undisputed value for its variety and originality. It would be indeed difficult to find in the literature of any other single country of the corresponding years ten poets who, as a group, surpass in excellence and diversity those included in this book: José Moreno Villa, Pedro Salinas, Jorge Guillén, Gerardo Diego, Federico García Lorca, Rafael Alberti, Emilio Prados, Vicente Aleixandre, Luis Cernuda and Manuel Altolaguirre. Among them only García Lorca—not superior to at least two or three of the rest—is known to non-Spanish-speaking readers.

Miss Turnbull has done a really remarkable job in the almost impossible task of translating ten poets distinguished every one of them by the difficulties which characterize twentieth-century poetry in Spain as elsewhere. Her translations are faithful and preserve very often the exquisite and refined lyricism of the originals. In general Miss Turnbull does better when translating poetry of an abstract and intellectual tone than when she has to deal with poetry marked by richness of color and imagery or a language closer to the concrete as in the case of Lorca. This explains the fact that in a few cases she has slipped in very elementary words or phrases, as when she translates "compadre" by "my father," in Lorca's *Romance sonámbulo* (page 185).

Salinas' reminiscences are delightful, a perfect evocation of the ten poets. Those who have known them personally, as the reviewer has, will enjoy Salinas' clear-cut portraits. Others will understand through them the atmosphere of friendliness as well as the devotion which inspired this remarkable group, a group of artists and truly gifted writers who gathered the harvest prepared by the great poets of the previous generation—Unamuno, Antonio Machado, Juan Ramón Jiménez—and who formed, grouped together, the Spanish counterpart of Post-War poetry (we refer to the period following the first World War) in other countries.

ANGEL DEL RÍO

Columbia University



*Manual de entonación española.* By Tomás Navarro. New York, Hispanic Institute in the United States, 1944. Pp. 306.

Teachers of Spanish have eagerly awaited the publication of this book. If anyone is disappointed in it he is very difficult to please. Based upon many years of teaching, observation and instrumental investigation, it is well organized and exhaustive. The important problems in the field have been treated in an illuminating manner even when the evidence for a satisfactory solution is not yet available.

The book has three aims: to organize the known material, to point out problems for investigation, and to provide a method for teaching Spanish intonation. It deals primarily with the literary language and the intonation of the speech of educated people, but regional differences are reported when there is information on them.

The author points out that the typical musical inflections of a language constitute one of the most intimate aspects of its linguistic tradition, that they have both a grammatical and an emotional value, and that a mastery of intonation is indispensable not only for the practical use of a language but also for the linguistic analysis. The learner tends to resist a melodic adaptation while accepting sounds and grammar although it is of similar importance.

Under general observations the author treats the range of pitch variation, the normal pitch, and the melodic unit. He does not believe that the rhythmic-semantic unit is satisfactory as a basis for the analysis of Spanish intonation. This unit corresponds to the measure in music and to the intensity group in verse, while the melodic unit corresponds to the line of verse. We are not told what the musical equivalent is. The author says that the limits of the melodic unit coincide with those of the phonic group. In the *Manual de pronunciación española* a phonic group is defined as the portion of discourse between two successive pauses. Here he says that the divisions are not always marked by pauses, but frequently merely by a decrease in intensity, a slowing of the articulation or by a more or less brusque change in the pitch without a real interruption of the vocalic vibrations. Delimitation is one of the most difficult problems in phonetics. Within an uninterrupted series of articulations there is an interpenetration and overlapping which makes it difficult to find any point at which we may say that one sound has ended and the next has not begun. This is true of the syllable and of all other groups except the phonic group. It is permissible to use the pause as a boundary in any type of delimitation because it may be considered as the absence of any one of the phonetic elements: articulation, intensity, pitch. But it is doubtful if anything besides pitch and its absence should be used to delimit melodic groups. It is possible of course to identify significant melodic patterns without delimiting melodic groups too precisely.

The author shows wisdom in not allowing his terminology and categories to become unwieldy. His method of procedure is to divide the sentence into melodic units, describe the beginning, middle and end of each unit, and to

identify the intensive and distensive movements of the sentence. The most significant modifications are to be found at the ends of the melodic units; and here he limits himself to five types which he calls *tonemas de cadencia*, *anticadencia*, *semicadencia*, *semianticadencia* and *suspensión*. This arbitrary limitation of things to be looked for makes possible the classification of the material into a manageable number of categories.

The main part of the book is devoted to an extensive analysis of the four types of intonation: enunciative, interrogative, volitive and emotional. These are based primarily upon the four types of sentence: declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory. But since any sentence may express many different shades of meaning as the intonation changes with the attitude of the speaker, the form of the sentence predominates in the determination of intonation in relatively unemotional language, especially in reading, while the attitude predominates in relatively emotional language especially in speech. Navarro combines these two approaches on the basis of the syntactic function of intonation.

Intonation is defined as the pitch curve. The author tends to attribute the communication of varying shades of emotion primarily to intonation. As he advances into the more emotional phases, however, he points out the presence of many other factors: modifications in quality, intensity and quantity, pauses, expiratory accent, muscular tension, facial expression, gesture, posture and movements of the body. An analysis of pitch alone would give an incomplete picture of the elements involved in oral expression. The author does not limit his description to pitch, but gives the impression of underestimating the importance of other elements.

The book would be easier to read if graphs instead of formulas were used in the text. Seven pages of graphs are given at the end. The use of small dots for unstressed syllables and large dots for stressed syllables would provide direct data on intensity variations and indirect data on quantity variations, but would not show the direction of the pitch shift within the syllable. The relative value of these two systems is a matter of opinion. Daniel Jones combines the two in a practical manner.

The conclusion, which contains a summary of the idiomatic traits of Spanish intonation in the form of a list of nineteen characteristics, is illuminating and useful. There are twelve pages of exercises.

The author is to be congratulated upon the consistency with which he has carried out the objectives set forth by him at the beginning. All serious teachers of Spanish will be grateful for so authoritative an exposition of an important aspect of their subject.

CLARENCE E. PARMENTER

*The University of Chicago*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

- Ashcom, B. B., and Goodell, Blanche E., *Functional Spanish Review Grammar and Composition*. New York, Macmillan, 1945. Pp. x+320.
- Brunet, Berthelot, *Histoire de la littérature canadienne française*. Montreal, L'Arbre, 1946. Pp. 187.
- Fuenzalida, Miguel de (pseudonym of Alberto Edwards), *Roman Clavo, el Sherlock Holmes Chileno*. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Raymond L. Grismer and Mary B. MacDonald. New York, Macmillan, 1946. Pp. x+154.
- Grismer, Raymond L., and Molinos, Margarita W., *Easy Spanish American Reader*, a Spanish reader for beginners, with vocabularies by Evelyn D. Corbett. New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1945. Pp. ix+90.
- Guillen, Jorge, *Cantico: Fe de vida*. Mexico, Litoral, 1945; New York, Macmillan, 1946. Pp. 412.
- Hadamard, Jacques, *The Psychology of Invention in the Mathematical Field*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1945. Pp. xiii+143.
- Hatcher, Anna Granville, *Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French*. (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. XLIII.) Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942. Pp. 213.
- Jodelle, Estienne, *Cléopâtre captive*. A critical edition by Lowell Bryce Ellis. (University of Pennsylvania, Publication of the Series in Romance Languages and Linguistics, Extra Series, No. 9.) Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946. Pp. viii+128.
- Malkiel, Yakov, *The Derivation of Hispanic fealdad (e), fieldad (e), and frialdad (e)*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics. Vol. 1, No. 5.) Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1945. Pp. 189-214.
- Malmberg, Bertil, *Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers. Poème français du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, publié avec introduction, notes et glossaire. Lund, Etudes romanes, par Alf Lombard, 1, 1940. Pp. 210.
- Marion, Seraphin, *A la conquête du haut savoir*. A propos de la section *North American French language and literature* de la *MLA*. Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 1945. Pp. 27.
- Maupassant, Guy de, *Choix de Contes*. Edited by F. C. Green. Cambridge, University Press, 1945. Pp. xxix+326.
- Maurois, André, *La Machine à lire les pensées*. Edited by Edward P. Shaw and Charles W. Colman. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1944. Pp. xiii+175.
- Muller, Henri François, *L'Epoque Mérovingienne, Essai de synthèse de philologie et d'histoire*. New York, S. F. Vanni, 1945. Pp. 299.

- Nicolson, Marjorie Hope, *Newton Demands the Muse. Newton's "Opticks" and the Eighteenth-century Poets*. (History of Ideas Series, No. 2.) Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1946. Pp. xi+178.
- Norlin, George, *The Quest of American Life*. (University of Colorado Studies, Series B, Studies in the Humanities, Vol. 2, No. 3). Boulder, University of Colorado Press, 1945. Pp. xvi+280.
- Notes Hispanic V*. New York, The Hispanic Society of America, 1945. Pp. 132.
- Oda, Wilbur H., *The Subject of Realism in the Revue de Paris (1829-1858)*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1943. Pp. x+94.
- Olschki, Leonardo, *Machiavelli, the Scientist*. Berkeley, The Gillick Press, 1945. Pp. 58.
- Pane, Remigio Ugo. *English Translation from the Spanish, 1484-1943*. A bibliography. (Rutgers University Studies in Spanish, No. 2.) New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1944. Pp. vi+218.
- Prezzolini, Giuseppe, *Repertorio bibliografico della storia e della critica della letteratura italiana dal 1932 al 1942*. New York, S. F. Vanni, 1946. Pp. xvi+331.
- Renaissance, revue trimestrielle*, II-III (1944-1945). New York, Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes, 1945. Pp. 541.
- Ronsard, Pierre de, *Poèmes*. Choisis et commentés par André Barbier. (Blackwell's French Texts.) Oxford, Blackwell, 1945. Pp. xx+204.
- Ronsjo, Einar, *La Vie de Saint Nicolas par Wace, poème religieux du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, publié d'après tous les manuscrits*. Lund, Etudes romanes, par Alf Lombard, v, 1942. Pp. 221.
- Rosenbaum, Sidonia Carmen, *Modern Women Poets of Spanish America*. New York, Hispanic Institute, 1945. Pp. 273.
- Simone, Joseph Francis de, *Alessandro Manzoni, Esthetics and Literary Criticism*. New York, S. F. Vanni, 1945. Pp. 429.
- Thorndike, Lynn, *The Herbal of Rufinus*. Assisted by Francis Benjamin, Jr. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1945. Pp. xliii+476.
- Tjerneld, Hakan. *Moamin et Ghatrif, Traités de Fauconnerie et des Chiens de Chasse*. Edition princeps de la version franco-italienne, avec trois planches hors texte. Stockholm, Paris, Thiébaud, 1945. Pp. ii+443.
- Trevino, S. N., *Spoken Spanish, for colleges and the armed forces*. Basic course. Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., 1945. Pp. x+647.
- Vercors, *La Marche à l'étoile*. New York, Pantheon Books, 1946. Pp. 78.

*We are pleased to announce  
for publication in 1947*

## ÉCRIVAINS MODERNES

*Edited by* JOHN L. McNULTY  
*and* JULIUS S. LOMBARDI, *Seton Hall College*

*Écrivains Modernes* will introduce third or fourth semester college students to the present-day period of French literature. Selections represent authors acclaimed by contemporary critics, the majority being members of the French Academy. Each selection—short story or excerpt from a novel—is a complete entity. Accompanying editorial material will help students to enjoy and understand the text and will deepen their interest in the modern period.

---

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

*"Columbia continues to  
corner the market—"*

## RENAISSANCE LITERARY CRITICISM

By Vernon Hall, Jr.

This long essay about literary criticism of the Renaissance period in France, Italy and England, reveals the profound influence of social conditions on critical thought.

"This is a provocative thesis, but one we should be inclined to dismiss if Hall did not drive home his argument by quotation after quotation with a persistence which would leave a dialectic materialist red with envy. . . . In publishing this work, Columbia University Press continues to corner the market on Renaissance criticism. This volume compares favorably in scholarship and imagination . . . it is rich in challenging generalizations and hypotheses."—Robert J. Clements, *New York Times Book Reviews*.

\$3.00

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Morningside Heights New York 27

*"Indispensable"*

A Bibliography of  
English Translations  
From Medieval Sources

BY CLARISSA P. FARRAR AND AUSTIN P. EVANS

Nearly 4000 alphabetical listings are of important literary sources produced during the period of Constantine the Great to the year 1500, within an area roughly including Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia.

"The most comprehensive, complete and accurate guide in this field of bibliography that has yet appeared . . . indispensable for any one interested in the Middle Ages, connoisseur, scholar or teacher."—A. C. Krey, *Chairman, Dept. of History, University of Minnesota*

"All medievalists will be grateful for the volume and depend upon it heavily for many uses. . . . The printing and format are a delight to the eye."—Margaret Schlanch, *New York University*

"The work is carefully done, the material is conveniently arranged and the bibliography seems to be thoroughly inclusive."—John L. LaMonte, *University of Pennsylvania*

\$7.50

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

2960 Broadway

New York 27

New York



